

EXHIBIT 9

In the Matter of:
ONF Enterprises, LLC v. USA

February 15, 2024

Condensed Transcript with Word Index



For The Record, Inc.
(301) 870-8025 - www.ftrinc.net - (800) 921-5555

1	3
1 IN THE UNITED STATES COURT OF FEDERAL CLAIMS	1 P R O C E E D I N G S
2	2 - - - - -
3	3 (Proceedings called to order, at 2:02 p.m.)
4 ONF ENTERPRISES, LLC,) Case No.	4 THE CLERK: The United States Court of Federal
5 Plaintiff,) 23-704L	5 Claims is now in session, the Honorable Stephen S.
6 vs.)	6 Schwartz presiding.
7 THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,)	7 THE COURT: Please be seated.
8 Defendant.)	8 Afternoon, everyone.
9	9 MR. KUSHNIR: Afternoon, Judge.
10	10 MR. HALKOWSKI: Good afternoon.
11	11 THE COURT: We're here for argument on the
12 Courtroom 4	12 Government's motion to dismiss in ONF Enterprises, LLC
13 Howard T. Markey National Courts Building	13 versus United States, Number 23-704L.
14 717 Madison Place, N.W.	14 Can counsel please identify themselves for the
15 Washington, D.C.	15 record, starting with the Plaintiff.
16 Thursday, February 15, 2024	16 MR. HALKOWSKI: Good afternoon, Your Honor. My
17 2:00 a.m.	17 name is Tom Halkowski. I'm with Fish and Richardson on
18 Oral Argument	18 behalf of the Plaintiff. And with me today is Kurt
19	19 Glitzenstein, also with Fish. He'll be doing the bulk of
20	20 the argument this afternoon. And joining with us this
21 BEFORE: THE HONORABLE STEPHEN S. SCHWARTZ	21 afternoon, also, is Ms. Gayle Nix-Jackson, actually the
22	22 granddaughter of Orville Nix, the person who actually,
23	23 you know, took the film that this is all about.
24	24 THE COURT: Good to meet you all. Mr.
25 Reported by: Karen Willoughby, CER, Digital Reporter	25 Halkowski, what's your colleague's name?
2	4
1 APPEARANCES:	1 MR. GLITZENSTEIN: It's Kurt Glitzenstein, Your
2 ON BEHALF OF THE PLAINTIFF:	2 Honor.
3 THOMAS L. HALKOWSKI, ESQ.	3 THE COURT: Glitzenstein, all right.
4 KURT GLITZENSTEIN, ESQ.	4 MR. GLITZENSTEIN: Yes. Also with Fish and
5 Fish and Richardson (DC)	5 Richardson, Your Honor.
6 901 15th Street, NW	6 THE COURT: Okay. And for the Government?
7 Washington, DC 20005	7 MR. KUSHNIR: Good afternoon, Your Honor.
8 (202) 783-5070	8 Borislav Kushnir for the United States. I'm joined by
9 halkowski@fr.com	9 Matthew Lewis, also from the Department of Justice, and
10	10 by Jeffrey Landou from the National Archives.
11	11 THE COURT: Good to meet you all.
12 ON BEHALF OF THE DEFENDANT:	12 All right. I thought today I'd hear first from
13 BORISLAV KUSHNIR, ESQ.	13 the United States because it's their motion and then from
14 MATTHEW LEWIS, ESQ.	14 the Plaintiff. Usually what I do, since I'm familiar
15 U. S. Department of Justice - Civil Division	15 with the pleadings and the briefs, is I suggest that you
16 Post Office Box 480	16 take a couple minutes to focus on anything in particular
17 Ben Franklin Station	17 that you'd like to amplify or add and then I'll give you
18 Washington, DC 20044	18 a few moments for that before I start jumping in.
19 (202) 616-1061	19 MR. KUSHNIR: Sure, thank you, Your Honor.
20 jenna.e.munnelly@usdoj.gov	20 Good afternoon. Your Honor, this takings case, which
21	21 concerns a recording of the assassination of President
22 ALSO PRESENT:	22 John F. Kennedy in 1963, was filed with this Court 45
23 Gayle Nix-Jackson	23 years after the Government initially retained the
24 Jeffrey Landou, NARA	24 recording, 30 years after the Government allegedly
25	25 appropriated the recording for the United States, and

<p style="text-align: right;">5</p> <p>1 seven and a half years after the predecessor to the 2 Plaintiff in this case, Ms. Gayle Nix-Jackson, knew 3 everything she needed to know to file a virtually 4 identical takings claim in the wrong forum. Any way you 5 look at this case, Your Honor, it is well outside the 6 six-year statute of limitations within 28 USC Section 7 2501.</p> <p>8 Now, in a takings case like this one where the 9 Government is not challenging, at least not at this 10 stage, whether the Plaintiff has a cognizable property 11 interest in the property that's being disputed, the 12 Federal Circuit tells us that the first thing that has to 13 happen, the very first thing that the Plaintiff has to 14 do, is they have to pinpoint the precise governmental 15 action that amounts to a taking of property in the case.</p> <p>16 Now, it's not entirely clear from ONF's 17 position so far in the litigation what that precise 18 governmental action is, but from their complaint and from 19 their response to the motion to dismiss, it appears as 20 though they're alleging that the taking was done through 21 the JFK Records Act, a statute that was passed by 22 Congress in 1992. And there's two major problems with 23 that argument.</p> <p>24 The first one is that the JFK Records Act does 25 not appropriate anything. It does not use language of</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">7</p> <p>1 Records Act does not appropriate anything and does not 2 authorize the appropriation.</p> <p>3 The other major issue with their argument is 4 that any claim based on the JFK Records Act is now 5 untimely. The Federal Circuit has said time and again 6 that legislative takings, that is a taking that is done 7 through the passage of legislation, accrues as soon as 8 the legislation becomes law. Here, the JFK Records Act 9 became law in 1992. That means that the six-year statute 10 of limitations on any claims under the JFK Records Act 11 expired in 1998, six years later. It seems as though ONF 12 is trying to argue that the claim perhaps -- the accrual 13 of the claim perhaps was suspended until a later point, 14 maybe 2021, when they received additional information 15 from Aerospace, the laboratory that reviewed the Nix film 16 in the 1970s.</p> <p>17 But what we know is that for accrual suspension 18 to apply, the standard is knew or should have known that 19 the claim existed. The Federal Circuit articulated that 20 standard in Martinez.</p> <p>21 What we know from the complaint and from the 22 exhibits to the complaint is that the predecessor to ONF, 23 Ms. Nix-Jackson, knew, or in this case believed, that the 24 Government continues to possess the original Nix film. 25 She sent a letter to the National Archives in 1991</p>
<p style="text-align: right;">6</p> <p>1 appropriation. It doesn't say anything about 2 appropriating or acquiring items for the United States. 3 It doesn't talk in terms of transferring title or rights 4 or ownership in items. It doesn't say any of that. All 5 it says when it comes to records of the assassination is 6 that agencies that have those records must transfer those 7 records to the National Archives, so a physical transfer 8 from one agency to another.</p> <p>9 To see that the JFK Records Act does not have 10 language of appropriation, all the Court has to do is to 11 compare that statute with Public Law 89-318, another 12 statute that Congress passed in 1965. That statute 13 expressly talks about acquiring records for the United 14 States. It talks about acquiring title, acquiring rights 15 to records. It sets up a procedure for which the 16 Government can identify the records it would like to 17 acquire. It even sets up a process for getting just 18 compensation for the records that the Government will 19 acquire. None of that is in the JFK Records Act.</p> <p>20 And what Public Law 89-318 shows is that when 21 Congress wants to appropriate records, and even more 22 specifically, records of the assassination of President 23 John F. Kennedy, it knows what language to use and knows 24 how to do that. And the fact that it did not use any of 25 that language in the JFK Records Act shows that the JFK</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">8</p> <p>1 demanding the return of the Nix film. That's Exhibit 2 2 to the complaint. She filed a complaint in D.C. District 3 Court, again, demanding the return of the original Nix 4 film. That's Exhibit 27 to the complaint. Those things 5 show that Ms. Nix-Jackson knew of her claim or at least 6 understood that there was a claim well before 2017, which 7 is six years before the claim was filed.</p> <p>8 So even when we apply the knew-or-should-have- 9 known standard from Martinez, the claims are still 10 untimely.</p> <p>11 THE COURT: So let's talk about the -- let's 12 talk about the substantive issue first and then we'll 13 talk about the statute of limitations issue. So the 14 allegation that the Government is in possession of the 15 Nix film, that's a factual claim that I have to assume to 16 be correct at this stage, right?</p> <p>17 MR. KUSHNIR: Yes, that's correct.</p> <p>18 THE COURT: All right. So right now, assuming 19 the Nix film exists and that it's in the possession of 20 the Archives, who owns it?</p> <p>21 MR. KUSHNIR: Well, that's a tricky question, 22 Your Honor, because the Government does not possess the 23 Nix film, but I -- and I understand you have to assume --</p> <p>24 THE COURT: Yeah, and don't fight the 25 hypothetical at this --</p>

<p style="text-align: right;">9</p> <p>1 MR. KUSHNIR: Right.</p> <p>2 THE COURT: Who owns it?</p> <p>3 MR. KUSHNIR: I think it might depend on how</p> <p>4 the Nix film would have reached the Government if the</p> <p>5 Government had had the film. If it had reached the</p> <p>6 National Archives through the Warren Commission, after</p> <p>7 the Warren Commission reviewed it, then it is possible</p> <p>8 that Public Law 89-318 would apply and the film would be</p> <p>9 appropriated to the Government through that Act.</p> <p>10 THE COURT: But I don't think that's the</p> <p>11 allegation in the complaint.</p> <p>12 MR. KUSHNIR: It's not the allegation, that's</p> <p>13 right.</p> <p>14 THE COURT: Okay. So -- okay. So who owns it?</p> <p>15 MR. KUSHNIR: So if that were to apply, then</p> <p>16 the Government would not own it and it would have to</p> <p>17 return it to ONF, as long as ONF truly is the successor-</p> <p>18 in-interest.</p> <p>19 THE COURT: I'm sorry. So if the Public Law,</p> <p>20 whatever it is, 318 doesn't apply, then ONF -- then ONF</p> <p>21 owns, assuming the allegations in the complaint about --</p> <p>22 about the transfer from Ms. Nix-Jackson to ONF are true?</p> <p>23 MR. KUSHNIR: Yes, I think that's right. Then</p> <p>24 the Government would have to return the film to Mr. Nix's</p> <p>25 heirs.</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">11</p> <p>1 Government would have permanent possession of it, even if</p> <p>2 ONF owns it, in some sense?</p> <p>3 MR. KUSHNIR: That sounds like a reasonable</p> <p>4 interpretation of the JFK Records Act, but, again, I just</p> <p>5 want to clarify, the way we read the JFK Records Act, it</p> <p>6 doesn't say anything about appropriating items from</p> <p>7 outside for the Government.</p> <p>8 THE COURT: Well, your briefing rests in part</p> <p>9 on the distinction between ownership and possession and</p> <p>10 so I'm trying to suss that out a little bit. Where I</p> <p>11 think you're coming out is if the JFK -- I'm sorry, if</p> <p>12 the Nix film came into the Government's possession before</p> <p>13 the time of the JFK Records Act, the Government has</p> <p>14 permanent possession of it, but not title, and if the</p> <p>15 Government got possession of it after the JFK Records</p> <p>16 Act, it doesn't have title and it would have to return it</p> <p>17 on demand. Is that right?</p> <p>18 MR. KUSHNIR: So if I can just say one thing</p> <p>19 before responding directly to the Court's question?</p> <p>20 THE COURT: Okay.</p> <p>21 MR. KUSHNIR: I think this distinction between</p> <p>22 possession and ownership is not quite as clear-cut as ONF</p> <p>23 made it out to be. There's the recent Jenkins case from</p> <p>24 the Federal Circuit, in which the Federal Circuit said if</p> <p>25 the Government takes something, even appropriately, let's</p>
<p style="text-align: right;">10</p> <p>1 THE COURT: Okay. So the JFK Records Act seems</p> <p>2 to say that the Government will keep permanent possession</p> <p>3 of the assassination records, though, doesn't it? At</p> <p>4 least that's the interpretation advanced by the Plaintiff</p> <p>5 and I don't think you've disagreed with that.</p> <p>6 MR. KUSHNIR: I have not disagreed with that,</p> <p>7 but what the JFK Records Act says is keeping permanent</p> <p>8 possession of what's defined as an assassination record,</p> <p>9 and what's defined as an assassination record is a record</p> <p>10 that is in the possession -- already in the possession of</p> <p>11 a government agency, and that's simply not the case with</p> <p>12 the JFK Records Act.</p> <p>13 THE COURT: Wait. Is that fighting a</p> <p>14 hypothetical again or is that --</p> <p>15 MR. KUSHNIR: Well, it's --</p> <p>16 THE COURT: Because, I mean, assume that the</p> <p>17 Nix tape found its way into the Government's possession</p> <p>18 by the time of the -- by the time of the JFK Records Act</p> <p>19 -- I mean, in that case, the JFK Records Act -- I mean,</p> <p>20 the Government's in permanent possession, right?</p> <p>21 MR. KUSHNIR: Yes. If we assume that the</p> <p>22 original Nix film was in the possession of a government</p> <p>23 agency before the JFK Records Act became law, then, yes,</p> <p>24 the JFK Records Act would apply.</p> <p>25 THE COURT: Okay. And in that case, the</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">12</p> <p>1 say pursuant to the police power, and then keeps</p> <p>2 possession of that thing after the need for its</p> <p>3 possession no longer holds true, that can amount to a</p> <p>4 taking.</p> <p>5 And so in this hypothetical scenario in which,</p> <p>6 let's say, the Nix film, the original Nix film, made it</p> <p>7 to the Government, the Government kept possession of it,</p> <p>8 even before the JFK Records Act was established, then</p> <p>9 there could be takings liability under the Jenkins line</p> <p>10 of reasoning.</p> <p>11 Now, of course, then ONF would rung headlong</p> <p>12 into a timeliness issue, an even greater timeliness issue</p> <p>13 than it has now.</p> <p>14 THE COURT: Yeah, yeah, if the taking arose</p> <p>15 because of the subpoena, I assume.</p> <p>16 MR. KUSHNIR: That's right, that's right.</p> <p>17 THE COURT: Right.</p> <p>18 MR. KUSHNIR: Because the Government obtained</p> <p>19 the original Nix film pursuant to the House Select</p> <p>20 Committee subpoena in 1978. The House Select Committee's</p> <p>21 need for the original Nix film evaporated in 1979 when</p> <p>22 the House Select Committee concluded its investigation</p> <p>23 and published the final report. So the claim, based on</p> <p>24 possession, just like the claim that the Federal Circuit</p> <p>25 recently described in Jenkins, that would have accrued in</p>

<p style="text-align: right;">13</p> <p>1 1979, which is even before the JFK Records Act ever came 2 into existence. 3 THE COURT: Okay. But one way or another, it 4 seems to me that you are not arguing that the Government 5 owns the tape. You're simply saying that if the 6 Government -- the Government can be assumed to be in 7 possession of the tape based on the allegations in the 8 complaint and that that possession may or may not be 9 permanent, depending on when the -- when the Government 10 got possession relative to the passage of the JFK Records 11 Act. 12 MR. KUSHNIR: I think that's right, Your Honor. 13 But, again, I do want to emphasize one thing. That's 14 part of the reason why it's so important for a Plaintiff 15 to pinpoint the precise governmental action that's 16 alleged to be the taking. I think what ONF is trying to 17 do is they're trying to get past the 1970s era and into a 18 closer period of time and that's why they're attaching 19 their takings claim to the JFK Records Act. And that's 20 why when we're talking about a taking, we're talking 21 about it in terms of the JFK Records Act and what we're 22 saying is the JFK Records Act itself does not talk about 23 taking property. It does not -- 24 THE COURT: Right, right, at least not 25 explicitly compared with the 1965 law.</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">15</p> <p>1 been alleged in this case. 2 THE COURT: Well, then they need to explain 3 In re Connick in some way. 4 MR. KUSHNIR: Okay. 5 THE COURT: I mean, they might even be estopped 6 -- judicially estopped from making that argument if it's 7 inconsistent with In re Connick because they prevailed in 8 that case. 9 MR. KUSHNIR: Okay. I'll have to take a look 10 at that certainly. 11 THE COURT: Okay. Would you have a look? 12 MR. KUSHNIR: Yes. 13 THE COURT: All right. And related to In re 14 Connick, are you aware of -- are you aware that the 15 Assassination Records Review Board promulgated 16 regulations implementing the JFK Records Act? 17 MR. KUSHNIR: I'm not familiar with the 18 regulations themselves. I am familiar with its work with 19 the Zapruder film and its assessment that the Zapruder 20 film can be acquired pursuant to authority under the JFK 21 Records Act. 22 THE COURT: Yeah. I'm asking about the Board's 23 regulations. 24 MR. KUSHNIR: I'm familiar with those, but I'm 25 not. I haven't looked at them in some time.</p>
<p style="text-align: right;">14</p> <p>1 MR. KUSHNIR: Exactly, exactly. 2 THE COURT: So the -- but here's another thing 3 about the JFK Records Act, are you familiar with the In 4 re Connick case from the 5th Circuit? 5 MR. KUSHNIR: I am not. 6 THE COURT: Okay. So in that case -- so the 7 cite is 124 F.3d 718. It's a very short case. It seems 8 to hold that the JFK Records Act allows NARA to seize 9 records owned by entities other than the Federal 10 Government. And that was a 1997 case, so it developed 11 well after the passage of the JFK Records Act. In that 12 case, you know, it was the Government, NARA, arguing that 13 it could use the JFK Records Act to go out and take 14 control -- and I'm using "take" kind of colloquially -- 15 but go out and take control and possession of documents 16 held elsewhere, in that case by Mr. Connick, the 17 prosecutor in New Orleans. You're not familiar with 18 that? 19 MR. KUSHNIR: No. 20 THE COURT: Okay. 21 MR. KUSHNIR: I'm not, Your Honor. What I do 22 know is through my conversations with the National 23 Archives today, their understanding of the JFK Records 24 Act is that it does not authorize the appropriation of 25 records or itself appropriate records in the way that has</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">16</p> <p>1 THE COURT: Okay. So are you aware of how they 2 define "assassination records" and where they can be 3 found? 4 MR. KUSHNIR: No. I imagine the definition 5 would probably be at least close to the definition in the 6 JFK Records Act -- 7 THE COURT: Yeah. 8 MR. KUSHNIR: -- which also defines the term. 9 THE COURT: Well, I mean, it's -- I can 10 represent to you that it's broader in a couple of 11 respects because it refers to records that are in private 12 hands. 13 MR. KUSHNIR: Okay. 14 THE COURT: So if that's right, then it 15 complicates your argument somewhat, kind of the way In re 16 Connick does. You can find them at 36 CFR 1290.1 and 17 following, I believe. 18 MR. KUSHNIR: Okay. And I'll certainly take a 19 look at that, Your Honor. I would suggest that the 20 Review Board's regulations don't necessarily mean much 21 for the way this Court interprets the plain meaning of 22 the JFK Records Act because that's simply a matter of 23 statutory construction, and if the plain meaning of the 24 JFK Records Act means something, this Court has to follow 25 that meaning regardless of what a government agency may</p>

<p style="text-align: right;">17</p> <p>1 have thought about.</p> <p>2 THE COURT: Well, wouldn't that be obligated to</p> <p>3 defer to the ARRB regulations, at least as long as</p> <p>4 Chevron is around?</p> <p>5 MR. KUSHNIR: I don't think the Court would</p> <p>6 have to defer as long as the plain meaning of the statute</p> <p>7 is clear. If there's an ambiguity, then, as you said,</p> <p>8 Your Honor, while Chevron is around, then perhaps, but</p> <p>9 we're arguing that the text of the JFK Records Act is</p> <p>10 clear on its face. There is no ambiguity. And in that</p> <p>11 case, the Court wouldn't need to defer to anyone.</p> <p>12 THE COURT: Well, the ARRB regulations</p> <p>13 actually, if I understand right, they might have</p> <p>14 sunsetted when ARRB sunsetted, but then they were</p> <p>15 repromulgated by NARA later, in which case you'd be</p> <p>16 arguing that the regulations defended by your client --</p> <p>17 or promulgated by your client's organization over there</p> <p>18 are invalid, which would be another thing for you to</p> <p>19 think about at a client service level, obviously.</p> <p>20 MR. KUSHNIR: Yes.</p> <p>21 THE COURT: Okay.</p> <p>22 MR. KUSHNIR: And if that becomes an issue that</p> <p>23 the Court is inclined to rule on, then I'd certainly like</p> <p>24 an opportunity to take a look at it --</p> <p>25 THE COURT: Okay.</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">19</p> <p>1 THE COURT: And one more thing about the</p> <p>2 Zapruder film, which you brought out. So you argue in</p> <p>3 your reply brief, especially, that the acquisition of the</p> <p>4 Zapruder film was different from the case at hand here,</p> <p>5 but I don't really understand why. Could you spell that</p> <p>6 out a little bit?</p> <p>7 MR. KUSHNIR: Sure. So the Zapruder film, the</p> <p>8 Review Board invoked authority under the JFK Records Act,</p> <p>9 but it took an additional post-enactment action by the</p> <p>10 Review Board to acquire the Zapruder film. There was</p> <p>11 an arbitration proceeding, or perhaps it was mediation</p> <p>12 -- I don't remember exactly, but there was an ADR -- some</p> <p>13 sort of ADR proceeding in which price was established and</p> <p>14 then --</p> <p>15 THE COURT: Like how was the ADR process</p> <p>16 invoked? Who invoked it?</p> <p>17 MR. KUSHNIR: So I believe the Review Board</p> <p>18 made a decision to acquire the Zapruder film. They</p> <p>19 reached out to the heirs of Abraham Zapruder and they</p> <p>20 decided on an ADR proceeding to determine the value of</p> <p>21 the film. And through that ADR proceeding, at the</p> <p>22 conclusion of it, the Government acquired the film. So</p> <p>23 it took post-enactment action. The Government did</p> <p>24 something affirmative in order to appropriate the Nix</p> <p>25 film -- I'm sorry, the Zapruder film --</p>
<p style="text-align: right;">18</p> <p>1 MR. KUSHNIR: -- go back to the National</p> <p>2 Archives, and perhaps submit some supplemental briefing</p> <p>3 on that.</p> <p>4 THE COURT: You know, what I often do in these</p> <p>5 circumstances when there are issues that end up -- that</p> <p>6 end up -- that might turn out to be relevant that the</p> <p>7 parties haven't had -- the parties haven't developed in</p> <p>8 the briefing, what I'll often do is send the parties back</p> <p>9 to do supplemental briefing.</p> <p>10 MR. KUSHNIR: Okay.</p> <p>11 THE COURT: We can talk about that at the end</p> <p>12 of the hearing if that would be helpful.</p> <p>13 MR. KUSHNIR: Right.</p> <p>14 THE COURT: All right. So you've talked about</p> <p>15 the exercise of police power a lot in your motion to</p> <p>16 dismiss, but I take it the parties seem to agree now that</p> <p>17 the subpoena didn't lead to the taking. So if that's</p> <p>18 right, then I don't really need to worry about whether</p> <p>19 the subpoena was a valid exercise of the police power or</p> <p>20 Congress' investigatory power and so on, would I?</p> <p>21 MR. KUSHNIR: I think that's right, Your Honor,</p> <p>22 you do not.</p> <p>23 THE COURT: Okay. So we can revisit that if it</p> <p>24 comes up on the Plaintiff's side, but --</p> <p>25 MR. KUSHNIR: Sure.</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">20</p> <p>1 THE COURT: The Zapruder film.</p> <p>2 MR. KUSHNIR: -- and paid compensation to the</p> <p>3 heirs of Mr. Zapruder as a result.</p> <p>4 THE COURT: So who had possession of the</p> <p>5 Zapruder film at the time that the Review board decided</p> <p>6 to take that action?</p> <p>7 MR. KUSHNIR: The Government did.</p> <p>8 THE COURT: Okay.</p> <p>9 MR. KUSHNIR: And it was undisputed that the</p> <p>10 Government had actual possession of the original Zapruder</p> <p>11 film.</p> <p>12 THE COURT: Okay. So in what way did it</p> <p>13 formalize its decision to take ownership of the Zapruder</p> <p>14 film? It published something in the Federal Register?</p> <p>15 What did it do?</p> <p>16 MR. KUSHNIR: I'm not sure exactly what they</p> <p>17 did to formalize their decision, but I know they did</p> <p>18 reach out to the heirs with an expression of intent to</p> <p>19 acquire the Zapruder film for the United States.</p> <p>20 THE COURT: I mean, that's -- it's hard for me</p> <p>21 to see how that could be what makes it -- like, I mean,</p> <p>22 what the 5th Amendment says is you can't take it without</p> <p>23 just compensation. So you can take it and you have to</p> <p>24 give just compensation.</p> <p>25 MR. KUSHNIR: Right.</p>

<p>21</p> <p>1 THE COURT: So, I mean, I can't tell from the 2 account you've just given whether reaching out to the 3 Zapruders was part of what made it a taking or if it's 4 just kind of the good manners to talk to the property 5 owner about the valuation process before you make the 6 taking formal. 7 MR. KUSHNIR: So I'm not sure whether it's one 8 or the other. 9 THE COURT: Okay. 10 MR. KUSHNIR: But the reason it matters is 11 because the Government took affirmative action to 12 appropriate -- to take this item pursuant to the 5th 13 Amendment. They didn't do it -- 14 THE COURT: But you don't know what the formal 15 action looked like. 16 MR. KUSHNIR: I don't know what the formal 17 action looked like. 18 THE COURT: Okay. So unless you know what the 19 formal action looked like and what it constituted, the 20 only difference you have between this case and the 21 Zapruder situation, there was an informal process that 22 led to payment, and in this one there hasn't been. 23 MR. KUSHNIR: Well, I think it goes beyond an 24 informal process that goes to payment. 25 THE COURT: Yeah, I get it, exactly. Okay.</p>	<p>23</p> <p>1 what I'm saying is, unlike here, in the Zapruder film, 2 the Government made an affirmative decision to acquire 3 the film, even before we get to the point about how much 4 is the film worth and how much is the Government going to 5 pay just compensation. The Government reached an 6 affirmative decision to acquire that film. We don't have 7 something like that here. 8 THE COURT: But then you don't know what the 9 affirmative decision looked like exactly. You don't know 10 how that decision was made or how it was announced or 11 formalized? 12 MR. KUSHNIR: I don't standing here. That's 13 certainly something I can provide, Your Honor. 14 THE COURT: All right, all right. If you don't 15 -- unless you know that, then it's hard for me to 16 distinguish between the Zapruder situation and this 17 situation. If you come back and you tell me that, okay, 18 the ARRB decides to appropriate property by taking a vote 19 and publishing a notice in the Federal Register, that's 20 one thing. But if the difference is just more like, 21 okay, we have it and we're going to ask the Zapruders 22 about paying for it and not ask the Nixes about paying 23 for it, that makes it harder for me to understand the 24 distinction. 25 So you need to kind of -- if you want to say</p>
<p>22</p> <p>1 I'm sorry, how does it go beyond just an informal process 2 that goes to payment? 3 MR. KUSHNIR: So even if there's nothing beyond 4 reaching out to the heirs of Mr. Zapruder, that alone is 5 some affirmative action that the Government took in order 6 to appropriate the Zapruder film. 7 THE COURT: But no, no, no, no, no, but there 8 -- now you're -- I don't know if that's right because the 9 whole question that I'm asking is whether reaching out to 10 the Zapruders was something that affected the acquisition 11 or whether it was just a good manners way of starting the 12 compensation process. Because, remember, in the 5th 13 Amendment, the taking of property and the payment, those 14 are different things. 15 MR. KUSHNIR: Sure. 16 THE COURT: So paying -- so if you take it, you 17 have to pay. 18 MR. KUSHNIR: Right. 19 THE COURT: So whether -- so the fact that ARRB 20 reached out to the Zapruders about starting a valuation, 21 that's analytically separate from what it is that 22 involved taking the property. 23 MR. KUSHNIR: I don't disagree with that. 24 THE COURT: Okay. 25 MR. KUSHNIR: I don't disagree with that. But</p>	<p>24</p> <p>1 that the Zapruder process was more formal and involved an 2 official decision, you need to document that and kind of 3 justify it theoretically and procedurally. 4 MR. KUSHNIR: Okay. That's fair, that's fair. 5 The only thing I would say about that is with the 6 Zapruder film -- and let's assume for a moment that there 7 was a formal decision made by the Review Board to acquire 8 the film, because I think there was such a decision. 9 Unfortunately, I don't know what form that decision took 10 standing before you today, but I'm happy to provide that 11 to you. 12 But if we assume for a moment that there was 13 such a decision made, that's the moment at which a 14 takings claim would have accrued because that's the 15 moment that the taking is taking place. That's why this 16 case is different because, here, there is no such 17 decision and so for the accrual date, ONF has to rely on 18 something way earlier. Here, they're relying on the JFK 19 Records Act because there is no decision by the 20 Government to appropriate or to acquire the Nix film. 21 THE COURT: Can you talk about the statute of 22 limitations now as long as you bring it up or is there 23 anything about the substance that you'd like to amplify? 24 MR. KUSHNIR: That might be a very good segue. 25 THE COURT: Okay. So you're presenting your</p>

25

1 motion as a 12(b)(6) motion, but obviously the statute of
2 limitations here is jurisdictional, right?

3 MR. KUSHNIR: Yes.

4 THE COURT: Okay.

5 MR. KUSHNIR: I think it should be a 12(b)(1)
6 motion, Your Honor. In fact, I noticed that as I was
7 preparing for today's argument.

8 THE COURT: So with the accrual date, it seems
9 like the statute of limitations argument comes down to
10 whether the accrual date is postponed in some way, and as
11 I understand the law at least, the accrual date can be
12 postponed essentially if the Government was concealing
13 information from ONF or if the fact of taking was
14 inherently unknowable to them. The Federal Circuit case
15 have used formulations kind of like those. Is that about
16 right?

17 MR. KUSHNIR: That's about right. My only
18 caveat was that -- is that the first part of what you
19 said, where the Government conceals something from the
20 other side, I think it's a little more nuanced than that.
21 It's when the Government conceals something such that the
22 Plaintiff would be unaware of their claim. If you would
23 like, Your Honor, I can find the specific passage from
24 Martinez that says that to give you the exact
25 formulation.

26

1 THE COURT: Oh, okay. So what you're saying is
2 that even if the Government concealed it, the Plaintiff
3 has to, in fact, be unaware?

4 MR. KUSHNIR: Exactly.

5 THE COURT: All right.

6 MR. KUSHNIR: And, here, if we assume for a
7 moment that the Government did conceal possession of the
8 Nix film, which, again, the Court has to assume for the
9 purposes of this motion, it was not concealed in a way
10 that made the Plaintiff unaware because, again, the
11 complaint shows us that Ms. Nix-Jackson continuously
12 demanded the Nix film and continuously told the
13 Government that it has possession of the Nix film. So
14 that shows us that the accrual date cannot be suspended
15 that way.

16 THE COURT: So the -- it's a bit of a puzzle
17 what the pleadings say about what the Plaintiff and its
18 predecessors knew and when, but, I mean, you don't seem
19 to be challenging the factual accuracy of anything in the
20 complaint, are you? It seems like even for purposes of
21 jurisdiction, you're treating it all as true.

22 MR. KUSHNIR: Yes.

23 THE COURT: Okay. So why does that make this
24 any more than a factual dispute about the truth of the
25 pleadings and the inferences I can draw from the

27

1 pleadings?

2 MR. KUSHNIR: Your Honor, in a way, it is. I
3 would point you to the fact that in Martinez, which is
4 the seminal accrual suspension case from the Federal
5 Circuit in which the Court articulated the standard for
6 accrual suspension, that claim was very similar to this
7 one. It was a claim where a service member brought a
8 claim to modify their service record and what they
9 claimed is that they have a letter from their ex-wife
10 showing the veracity of their claim.

11 And what the Federal Circuit said is that
12 that letter doesn't actually suspend the accrual date
13 because you can see from earlier proceedings, before that
14 letter from the ex-wife ever came into being, that the
15 Plaintiff maintained all along the veracity of their
16 position. And --

17 THE COURT: Okay.

18 MR. KUSHNIR: -- if I could just say one final
19 thing about it.

20 THE COURT: I'm sorry, go ahead.

21 MR. KUSHNIR: The reason that matters is
22 because Martinez was dismissed on a motion to dismiss by
23 the Court of Federal Claims.

24 THE COURT: That was actually the question I
25 was going to ask, the --

28

1 MR. KUSHNIR: And the Federal Circuit affirmed
2 that dismissal in a motion to dismiss. So even in a
3 motion to dismiss, if we assume almost all facts in the
4 complaint, this being a jurisdictional issue, you know,
5 maybe that has something to do with it, but you can look
6 at the allegations in the complaint, at what's in the
7 exhibits that are appended to the complaint, and you can
8 draw an inference of what -- what was known to the
9 Plaintiff.

10 THE COURT: But then I could also -- I mean,
11 does that foreclose me from looking at the pleadings and
12 assuming that the allegations about the diligence of the
13 search are true and assuming that allegations about the
14 knowledge in ONF and its predecessors are true? I could
15 also do that, right?

16 MR. KUSHNIR: You certainly could.

17 THE COURT: Okay.

18 MR. KUSHNIR: But at the end of the day, the
19 timeliness issue is really the only thing the Court has
20 to rule on. It's a jurisdictional matter. It's the
21 first thing the Court would have to rule on. And for
22 that, all you have to do is look at Exhibit 2 and Exhibit
23 27 to the complaint. Those layout specifically Ms. Nix-
24 Jackson's belief as early as 1991, before the JFK Records
25 Act even became law, that the Government, and

29

1 specifically the National Archives, continues to possess
2 the original Nix film. That's the only thing that
3 matters because if their allegation of a taking is based
4 on the idea that the Government continues to possess the
5 original Nix film, that actual knowledge -- and, again, I
6 call it knowledge; it's not really knowledge because the
7 Government doesn't have the film, so let's call it belief
8 instead -- that belief, as early as that belief is
9 demonstrated, that alone defeats the takings claim under
10 Section 2501.

11 THE COURT: But then I would have to -- what do
12 I do if they're jurisdictional and the facts in the
13 complaint that seem to conflict with each other or that
14 were -- contradict each other in some way? Like on the
15 one hand, you have the fact of a lawsuit against NARA for
16 the return of it, and on the other hand, you have this
17 letter to NARA in 1991 and so forth, but then you also
18 have allegations in the complaint that -- say that ONF
19 and its predecessors just didn't know.

20 So if you have factual allegation about ONF's
21 knowledge and its search that point in different
22 directions, how do I resolve those in your favor at the
23 pleadings stage?

24 MR. KUSHNIR: So I'll respond to that in two
25 ways, Your Honor. I don't think there is any

30

1 disagreement in the complaint between our position and
2 the Plaintiff's position. The reason is because if you
3 look at the one place in the complaint that talks about
4 the 2021 phone call -- and, Your Honor, I'll direct your
5 attention to paragraph 1-14 of the complaint on page 35.

6 THE COURT: Yep.

7 MR. KUSHNIR: Okay. So that reads on May 12th,
8 2021, a representative of Aerospace contacted counsel for
9 Plaintiff stating that Aerospace had, in fact, sent the
10 Nix film to NARA, not to the HSCA or UPI, as had been
11 previously reported. This seems to say that in 2021,
12 Plaintiff had received information that in 1978,
13 Aerospace returned the Nix film to NARA. This says
14 nothing about who has possession of the film in 1992,
15 when the JFK Records Act became law, and supposedly the
16 Nix film was appropriated for the United States. So even
17 this standalone allegation in no way makes this case
18 timely.

19 But the other thing I wanted to say is to the
20 extent you believe there --

21 THE COURT: Though I don't follow that, because
22 if what they're saying is they just had no idea who would
23 -- they didn't have a clear idea of who had it until
24 2021, getting more information about what happened to it
25 after Aerospace had it, I don't see why that's

31

1 irrelevant. Could you explain that a little bit more?

2 MR. KUSHNIR: Sure. The reason that matters is
3 because, according to ONF, the accrual date, the original
4 accrual date would be 1992 because that's the date on
5 which the JFK Records Act supposedly gave the Government
6 authority to appropriate the film. So what I think we
7 should be looking at is whether the Government possessed
8 the film in 1992, and this representation or alleged
9 representation from 2021, doesn't speak to that. It
10 doesn't say anything.

11 THE COURT: Oh, it just says -- it just says it
12 was given to NARA in 1978 and then there's a question
13 about what happened with 1978 and 1992?

14 MR. KUSHNIR: That's right, that's right.

15 THE COURT: Is there any evidence that NARA
16 returned any JFK records to anybody between 1978 and
17 1992?

18 MR. KUSHNIR: I'm not sure, Your Honor.

19 THE COURT: Okay. Then I don't understand why
20 -- I don't understand what you're doing other than raise
21 kind of a theoretical -- an unjustified hypothetical
22 about what could have happened in the gap.

23 MR. KUSHNIR: Well, I mean, I certainly
24 understand the Court's hesitance with this.

25 THE COURT: Okay.

32

1 MR. KUSHNIR: All I would say is what we should
2 care about is who possessed the film as of the date of
3 accrual, and this allegation says nothing about who
4 possessed the film as of the date of accrual.

5 THE COURT: Because it involves facts too far
6 before the date of accrual.

7 MR. KUSHNIR: That's right, that's right. But,
8 Your Honor, I'd like to point you to the evidence that's
9 directly contradictory to this.

10 THE COURT: Okay.

11 MR. KUSHNIR: As I said --

12 THE COURT: Please.

13 MR. KUSHNIR: -- Exhibit 2 to the complaint to
14 start. So that's at ECF 1-3.

15 THE COURT: Yep, I've got it.

16 MR. KUSHNIR: A letter from April 15th, 1991,
17 from Ms. Gayle Nix-Jackson to Mr. William Murphy at the
18 National Archives.

19 THE COURT: Yeah, they refer to that in the
20 complaint.

21 MR. KUSHNIR: That's right. And the very first
22 sentence says, "Per our telephone conversation on today's
23 date, this letter will serve as an unambiguous request
24 for the return of the original film footage taken by the
25 grandfather" -- I'm sorry -- "my grandfather, Orville O.

<p style="text-align: right;">33</p> <p>1 Nix, of the John F. Kennedy assassination.”</p> <p>2 THE COURT: Mm-hmm.</p> <p>3 MR. KUSHNIR: So as early as 1991, we know that</p> <p>4 Ms. Nix-Jackson believed that the Government, and</p> <p>5 specifically the National Archives, had possession of the</p> <p>6 Nix film. That’s bolstered by Exhibit 1 to the</p> <p>7 complaint, which is a letter from UPI. That’s dated June</p> <p>8 4th, 1992, so just a few months after Ms. Nix-Jackson</p> <p>9 sent her letter to NARA.</p> <p>10 And there in the third paragraph on the first</p> <p>11 page, the second sentence reads, “In 1967, the United</p> <p>12 States Government acquired title to the Nix film for use</p> <p>13 in connection with the Warren Commission investigation</p> <p>14 concerning the assassination of President John Kennedy</p> <p>15 and” -- and this is the important part -- “the film,</p> <p>16 which was in UPI’s possession, is housed in the National</p> <p>17 Archives in Washington, D.C.”</p> <p>18 THE COURT: But then NARA responded to the 1991</p> <p>19 letter and they say, yeah, we found something, but it</p> <p>20 looks like it’s just the copy, we don’t seem to have the</p> <p>21 original. What’s the effect of that, if anything, on the</p> <p>22 accrual date?</p> <p>23 MR. KUSHNIR: I’m not sure it has an effect on</p> <p>24 the accrual date because the accrual depends on what the</p> <p>25 Plaintiff knew or should have known.</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">35</p> <p>1 very first thing, the most important thing she wants to</p> <p>2 accomplish through this DDC action is for the Court to</p> <p>3 direct the United States Government and those agencies</p> <p>4 involved in the original Nix film to produce it without</p> <p>5 further delay.</p> <p>6 So we see that Ms. Nix-Jackson continued to</p> <p>7 believe that the Government continues to possess the Nix</p> <p>8 film, and with the standard being knew or should have</p> <p>9 known, we can discern from this her actual knowledge --</p> <p>10 in this case, belief of when she could have brought this</p> <p>11 case against the Government.</p> <p>12 THE COURT: Are there any other possible</p> <p>13 interpretations of her filing a complaint other than that</p> <p>14 she actually knew where it -- where the tape was? I</p> <p>15 mean, is she using the -- could you use -- could you</p> <p>16 interpret the complaint as part of an investigation as</p> <p>17 opposed to revealing knowledge?</p> <p>18 MR. KUSHNIR: I’m sorry, the DDC complaint?</p> <p>19 THE COURT: Could you view -- exactly. Could</p> <p>20 you view the DDC complaint as part of an investigatory</p> <p>21 process rather than as an illustration of existing</p> <p>22 knowledge?</p> <p>23 MR. KUSHNIR: I don’t think so, Your Honor,</p> <p>24 because the DDC complaint, not only did it have a</p> <p>25 replevin cause of action in which she tried to obtain the</p>
<p style="text-align: right;">34</p> <p>1 THE COURT: But then if NARA says, yeah, we’ve</p> <p>2 looked at it and this just looks like a copy, it doesn’t</p> <p>3 look like the original, how does that bear on the</p> <p>4 question of what the Plaintiff knew or should have known?</p> <p>5 MR. KUSHNIR: I would suggest to you, Your</p> <p>6 Honor, that as early as 1991, Ms. Gayle Nix-Jackson could</p> <p>7 have brought this claim, before --</p> <p>8 THE COURT: Yeah, but then if NARA says all we</p> <p>9 have is a copy, how does that bear on what Plaintiff knew</p> <p>10 -- what she knew or should have known?</p> <p>11 MR. KUSHNIR: Right. So perhaps that would</p> <p>12 have dissuaded her, but we know it didn’t because</p> <p>13 later, in 2015 -- and, Your Honor, we can now look at</p> <p>14 Exhibit 27 --</p> <p>15 THE COURT: Okay.</p> <p>16 MR. KUSHNIR: -- to the complaint, this is the</p> <p>17 complaint that Ms. Gayle Nix-Jackson filed in D.C.</p> <p>18 District Court. And on the very first page, the very</p> <p>19 first line of the first paragraph says, “This is an</p> <p>20 action for return of a historical film of the John F.</p> <p>21 Kennedy assassination filmed by Dallas native, Orville</p> <p>22 Nix, on November 22nd, 1963.”</p> <p>23 And then that is repeated at the end as well on</p> <p>24 page 16, the first paragraph of the prayers for relief</p> <p>25 section. There, Ms. Gayle Nix-Jackson stated that the</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">36</p> <p>1 Nix film, it also had a takings cause of action in which</p> <p>2 she alleged many of the same allegations she alleges</p> <p>3 here. If she was able to bring a takings claim in 2015</p> <p>4 with the information she had in 2015, there’s no reason</p> <p>5 why she couldn’t bring a takings claim in the proper</p> <p>6 forum before this court in 2015, as well. So to wait</p> <p>7 until 2023, it simply doesn’t make sense with everything</p> <p>8 we know about this case.</p> <p>9 THE COURT: Okay. One more question. So if</p> <p>10 NARA did have the Nix tape, say at the time of the JFK</p> <p>11 Records Act, it would have been obligated to disclose it</p> <p>12 by now, right, or --</p> <p>13 MR. KUSHNIR: It --</p> <p>14 THE COURT: I’m sorry, go on.</p> <p>15 MR. KUSHNIR: Yes, it would have been obligated</p> <p>16 to make it publicly available, absolutely.</p> <p>17 THE COURT: Okay. Anything you’d like to add</p> <p>18 before I shift to your colleague? I’ll give you a chance</p> <p>19 for a reply at the end.</p> <p>20 MR. KUSHNIR: In that case, I think I’m okay.</p> <p>21 Thank you, Your Honor.</p> <p>22 THE COURT: Okay. Thank you, Mr. Kushnir.</p> <p>23 Mr. Glitzenstein?</p> <p>24 MR. GLITZENSTEIN: Yes, Your Honor. Thank</p> <p>25 you.</p>

<p style="text-align: right;">37</p> <p>1 May it please the Court, Your Honor. I'd like 2 to take the issues in the same order that my colleague 3 did -- 4 THE COURT: Of course. 5 MR. GLITZENSTEIN: -- with regard to the 6 statutory construction issue and then the statute of 7 limitations issues, if I may. 8 And to begin, I'd like to address directly the 9 hypothetical that you posed to the Government with regard 10 to assuming the allegations in the complaint to be 11 correct that NARA is currently in possession of the film, 12 would that mean that the Government has taken ownership 13 possession of the film? Our position is unambiguously 14 yes. 15 I wasn't entirely clear on the caveats with 16 regard to how the Government is addressing that issue 17 today on this motion, but I will note that in 2015, in 18 moving to dismiss Ms. Nix-Jackson's original complaint in 19 the District Court District of Columbia, they asked -- 20 they posed that hypothetical themselves and they answered 21 it quite clearly saying we would be unable to return the 22 film, i.e., in effect, we own the film, assuming that we 23 have it. And that was in their motion to dismiss, which 24 is part of our complaint. 25 This is Exhibit 28 to our complaint, Docket</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">39</p> <p>1 protection, and archiving, and availability is forever. 2 The Act doesn't specify any duration, no period 3 of time after which they had to return. That's a 4 permanent taking and that is taking ownership. There's 5 no distinction that I can see between ownership and 6 permanent retention. Those are precisely the same thing. 7 But as I said, the Government did more than 8 that in 2015. They answered the hypothetical that the 9 Court posed today. The Government continued, "Yet, even 10 if NARA did have the film, it would be an assassination 11 record under the JFK Act and the Act would preempt 12 Plaintiff's common law replevin claim seeking its 13 return." So in that hypothetical and the very 14 allegations that we make in our complaint, the Government 15 asserts ownership, full stop. 16 Again, it's not a -- there's no ambiguity, of 17 course, in the statutory language. And, moreover, I 18 mean, the Government's position, as I understand it, 19 rests on really the absence of certain language of 20 ownership or authorization of acquisition in the statute, 21 but, of course, that express language isn't required. 22 THE COURT: Do you have an authority on that? 23 MR. GLITZENSTEIN: Well, I mean, in general, 24 regulatory takings cases -- 25 THE COURT: No, regulatory takings cases are</p>
<p style="text-align: right;">38</p> <p>1 Number 1. In particular, at page 18 -- and this is the 2 Government's motion at that time -- first, they 3 interpreted the JFK Records -- Assassination Records Act, 4 the 1992 Act, in the same way effectively that Plaintiff 5 interprets it in this matter. And they say, To the 6 contrary, the JFK Act requires assassination records to 7 be "preserved, protected, archived, and made available to 8 the public at the National Archives." 9 THE COURT: Mr. Kushnir, take your seat. 10 MR. GLITZENSTEIN: Hmm? 11 MR. KUSHNIR: I just wanted to ask what page 12 we're on. 13 MR. GLITZENSTEIN: It's page 18. 14 MR. KUSHNIR: Thank you. 15 MR. GLITZENSTEIN: Continuing, the Government 16 says -- after quoting the statute at Section 4(d)(1), the 17 Government said, "Effectively preventing NARA from 18 releasing the actual assassination records in NARA's 19 collection to Plaintiff or anyone else." They can't 20 return it. And that's actually unambiguous from the 21 statute. In fact, the section that they quote, 4(d)(1), 22 includes that language of Congress -- the collection, 23 excuse me, shall be preserved, protected, archived, and 24 made available to the public. That's directly from the 25 statute and it's unambiguous. That preservation,</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">40</p> <p>1 different. A regulatory -- you know the difference 2 between, I mean, like a physical taking of ownership and 3 a regulatory taking. There are takings and there are use 4 restrictions. We aren't in the world of use 5 restrictions. 6 MR. GLITZENSTEIN: Exactly, Your Honor. I was 7 just trying to reason of analogy. That even -- I mean, 8 in a physical taking case -- 9 THE COURT: Well, no, but then -- then I'm 10 sorry, let's stick with the -- kind of the world of 11 physical takings. Do you have an example of any state or 12 federal statute or regulation that's been held to create 13 a transfer of ownership, but that doesn't talk in terms 14 of title and ownership? Like what's the best analogy you 15 have to this? 16 MR. GLITZENSTEIN: Well, Your Honor, I don't 17 think I need an analogy. I think the Government itself 18 has interpreted -- repeatedly interpreted the 1992 JFK 19 Records Act as conveying exactly that authority to the 20 Government. And it's in multiple different contexts in 21 connection with the Zapruder film and I can address 22 several of the Court's questions about that. 23 If you're asking do I have a case in a physical 24 takings context where the Court concluded that a statute 25 that lacks the words of acquisition or ownership in</p>

<p style="text-align: right;">41</p> <p>1 substance conveys authority, I don't have a case cite on 2 that to offer the Court today. I mean, I would be happy 3 to look further. 4 THE COURT: Okay. 5 MR. GLITZENSTEIN: Frankly, given the clarity 6 of this issue with regard to how the Government itself 7 has interpreted the Act -- ah, my colleague reminds me, 8 there is the 5th Circuit Connick case that Your Honor 9 mentioned, which I was looking at at counsel table a 10 moment ago. But the Government here itself with regard 11 to the 1992 Act has taken this position. There is, of 12 course, the ARRB itself having concluded that it had 13 authority under the 1992 Act to acquire ownership of the 14 Zapruder film, and this is in our complaint as well, Your 15 Honor. I think I can address some of the Court's 16 questions about that process and how it unfolded. 17 This is Exhibit 37 to our complaint. And we 18 have included with our complaint the report or decision, 19 excuse me, of the arbitration panel for the Zapruder film 20 and they explain -- and this is at page 4 of the exhibit, 21 that "On August 1st, 1988, the Assassination Research 22 Board, directed that the Zapruder film be transferred to 23 the records collection within the National Archives and 24 Records Administration. That same day, August 1, 1998, 25 the Government seized the film itself, but not the</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">43</p> <p>1 authority under the 1992 Act to effect such seizures. So 2 for the question that's operative here today, the ARRB 3 first concluded that it did have the authority to seize 4 property in the hands of public citizens and, of course, 5 the consequence of that being just compensation. So that 6 was the ARRB. The arbitration panel agreed and then the 7 Department of Justice itself endorsed that. And this is 8 page 2 of Exhibit 37. 9 The Department of Justice, in its release of 10 the arbitration panel decision, states -- it first 11 describes, in the second-to-last paragraph, the second 12 page of the exhibit, describes the 1992 Act, describes 13 the purpose, and then says, "Under that law, on August 1, 14 1998, the camera original of the film became public 15 property when it was transferred to the JFK records 16 collections at the Archives." 17 THE COURT: So by operation of law, it became 18 -- the camera original became public property? 19 MR. GLITZENSTEIN: That's right, Your Honor. 20 THE COURT: Okay. So the question, the 21 statutory -- 22 THE COURT: I'm sorry, though, that actually 23 raises a question in my mind about your briefing, because 24 what you say is that the enactment of the JFK Records Act 25 did not itself effect a taking. Do you see the tension</p>
<p style="text-align: right;">42</p> <p>1 copyright to the film." Continuing, "The panel said the 2 Government seizure of the film was pursuant to special 3 legislation enacted by Congress and signed into law by 4 the President." 5 THE COURT: But what happened physically when 6 this was going on? I mean, directed that it be 7 transferred to the National Archives, I mean, that's just 8 the operation of what goes on in the -- under the JFK 9 Records Act. This is descriptive of where it went. 10 MR. GLITZENSTEIN: Well, beyond the language of 11 seizure, Your Honor, I don't have any further specificity 12 about how the seizure was effected. 13 THE COURT: Yeah. How about directed? Like 14 when the Board directed that it be transferred, how did 15 it direct? Was there a vote? Was there a publication in 16 the Federal Register? What happened? 17 MR. GLITZENSTEIN: I don't believe there was a 18 publication in the Federal Register. I've never seen any 19 reference to that, Your Honor. 20 THE COURT: Okay. 21 MR. GLITZENSTEIN: So this is at least a little 22 more detail on what happened with the Zapruder film, but 23 continuing, it doesn't stop there. That was the decision 24 of the arbitration panel and as we discussed in our 25 brief, the ARRB itself concluded that it had the</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">44</p> <p>1 there? 2 MR. GLITZENSTEIN: Well, it's the enactment 3 coupled with the possession of the film, the acquisition 4 of the film by NARA. It's not the enactment, per se. I 5 mean, there has to -- it's the actions taken pursuant to 6 the enactment. 7 THE COURT: Okay. So what was the act taken 8 pursuant to the enactment? So as you know, it's your 9 obligation to pinpoint what particular act or event 10 constituted the taking. What was that in this case? 11 MR. GLITZENSTEIN: It would be the by operation 12 of the sequence of events -- by operation of the 13 provisions of the 1992 Act, the preexisting possession by 14 NARA, as the evidence now shows, of the original Nix 15 film, coupled with the enactment of the Act -- 16 THE COURT: Okay. 17 MR. GLITZENSTEIN: -- those two things together 18 were the triggering event. 19 THE COURT: Okay. So given that the Government 20 was already in possession of the Nix film, allegedly, the 21 taking became effective at the moment the JFK Records Act 22 went into effect because, at that moment, given 23 possession, ownership transferred to the Government. 24 MR. GLITZENSTEIN: Given -- yes, Your Honor. 25 Given what we learned through the diligence in 2021 and</p>

<p style="text-align: right;">45</p> <p>1 the timeline that we established of the very important</p> <p>2 issue of the chain of custody of the Nix film, which I'll</p> <p>3 cite it more on a connection with the statute of</p> <p>4 limitations issues, but given what we learned, at that</p> <p>5 point, yes, the evidence that we have now available to us</p> <p>6 leads us to the conclusion that NARA, not the House</p> <p>7 Subcommittee, obtained possession of the original Nix</p> <p>8 film from Aerospace in 1998, right?</p> <p>9 So they had possession, they denied having</p> <p>10 possession in 1991, as we've discussed, when Ms. Nix-</p> <p>11 Jackson approached them, but then when the law came into</p> <p>12 effect -- the 1992 Records Act came into effect, at that</p> <p>13 point, by virtue of having preexisting possession, it's</p> <p>14 that combination of events.</p> <p>15 And, you know, this whole issue as we now see</p> <p>16 in the Zapruder context whether the possession was before</p> <p>17 or after, you know, we see that the Government has now</p> <p>18 erased that distinction and has decided that it has the</p> <p>19 authority, pursuant to the 1992 Act, to go out and take</p> <p>20 ownership of private property that falls into the</p> <p>21 definition of an assassination.</p> <p>22 THE COURT: And we know that from In re Connick</p> <p>23 basically.</p> <p>24 MR. GLITZENSTEIN: And the Government's</p> <p>25 treatment of Zapruder, both.</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">47</p> <p>1 from -- of the film, even though it wasn't even in the</p> <p>2 Government's possession, then why wouldn't the JFK</p> <p>3 Records Act also have transferred possession of the Nix</p> <p>4 film to the Government's ownership even if it wasn't held</p> <p>5 by the Government?</p> <p>6 MR. GLITZENSTEIN: So let me break this down,</p> <p>7 and if I misspoke, Your Honor, I apologize. As I say, I</p> <p>8 was looking for the correct exhibit to answer Your</p> <p>9 Honor's question. So let me start with the question of</p> <p>10 the Zapruder film --</p> <p>11 THE COURT: Okay.</p> <p>12 MR. GLITZENSTEIN: -- and where I -- based on</p> <p>13 the information available, Exhibit 9 does include an</p> <p>14 affidavit from a representative of the House Select</p> <p>15 Committee, and it says that the Zapruder film was</p> <p>16 returned to Mr. Henry Zapruder in 1978. That was the</p> <p>17 point I was hunting for previously. And so I don't know</p> <p>18 what happened -- you know, what happened from --</p> <p>19 THE COURT: But I thought the Tunheim report</p> <p>20 said that Henry Zapruder gave it to the Archives in 1978,</p> <p>21 even if legal ownership was retained by the Zapruder</p> <p>22 family. Am I wrong about that?</p> <p>23 MR. GLITZENSTEIN: I would have to look at</p> <p>24 that, Your Honor.</p> <p>25 THE COURT: Okay.</p>
<p style="text-align: right;">46</p> <p>1 THE COURT: Though who had the Zapruder film at</p> <p>2 the time that the JFK Records Act went into effect?</p> <p>3 MR. GLITZENSTEIN: So our evidence and what we</p> <p>4 have alleged in the complaint is that it was returned by</p> <p>5 the House Subcommittee to -- I believe it was Mr.</p> <p>6 Zapruder's son. We have an affidavit in the complaint.</p> <p>7 I think it would be Exhibit 9.</p> <p>8 THE COURT: So what you're saying is that the</p> <p>9 Zapruder film was in -- it's a private property in the</p> <p>10 possession of a private individual and that it became the</p> <p>11 government property by operation of law? But if that's</p> <p>12 right, then how can you say that the JFK Records Act's</p> <p>13 effect depends on the Nix film being in the Government's</p> <p>14 possession at that time?</p> <p>15 MR. GLITZENSTEIN: Well, all I'm -- I'm saying</p> <p>16 it doesn't matter ultimately. One could read the statute</p> <p>17 as saying it was preexisting, things in the Government</p> <p>18 possession. The Government has taken a broader view with</p> <p>19 regard to Zapruder. And I may have missed part of your</p> <p>20 question, Your Honor, because I was looking for the</p> <p>21 exhibit --</p> <p>22 THE COURT: Oh, but then -- then you've got an</p> <p>23 even worse statute of limitations problem than you would</p> <p>24 have had otherwise. Let me explain why. Because if you</p> <p>25 are right that the JFK Records Act transferred ownership</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">48</p> <p>1 MR. GLITZENSTEIN: So I -- so if there was a</p> <p>2 subsequent transfer, as I started to say, I can't speak</p> <p>3 to the status of the Zapruder film after this date, and</p> <p>4 if there was some further activity with that, I would</p> <p>5 have to take a further look at that. But my point with</p> <p>6 regard to the timing issue, Your Honor, was just simply</p> <p>7 that, as a matter of statutory construction and</p> <p>8 application, the ARRB concluded that it could seize and</p> <p>9 compensate the Zapruders for that film after the 1992 JFK</p> <p>10 Records Act and the Government endorse that</p> <p>11 interpretation of the 1992 Records Act.</p> <p>12 THE COURT: By the way, can we clarify just to</p> <p>13 make sure I understand what you're arguing? So I think</p> <p>14 you aren't arguing that the House Subcommittee subpoena</p> <p>15 effected a taking, are you?</p> <p>16 MR. GLITZENSTEIN: We are not, Your Honor.</p> <p>17 THE COURT: Okay. And you aren't arguing that</p> <p>18 it's a taking based on a withholding of the records from</p> <p>19 the public. It all comes down to the JFK Records Act?</p> <p>20 MR. GLITZENSTEIN: We are not arguing the first</p> <p>21 part and, yes, it comes down to the JFK Records Act, Your</p> <p>22 Honor.</p> <p>23 THE COURT: Okay.</p> <p>24 MR. GLITZENSTEIN: Yes, that's correct.</p> <p>25 THE COURT: So -- okay. So that means that I</p>

49

1 don't need to worry about things like whether the
 2 subpoena was a valid exercise of the police power,
 3 Congress' investigatory power? There's a lot of it in
 4 the briefing, but it seems like it's all irrelevant
 5 unless I'm missing something.
 6 MR. GLITZENSTEIN: From our perspective, Your
 7 Honor, for this motion, we don't see that as being --
 8 THE COURT: Okay.
 9 MR. GLITZENSTEIN: -- relevant. And the fact
 10 of the nondisclosure by NARA is not -- we've addressed
 11 that in the briefing as well.
 12 THE COURT: So what you're saying is that given
 13 that -- given that -- given your belief now that the Nix
 14 film was in the Government's possession at the time the
 15 JFK Records Act went into effect, the taking occurred
 16 when the JFK Records Act went into effect and, at that
 17 time, ownership was transferred to the Government, not
 18 just possession, which the Government already had, but
 19 ownership.
 20 MR. GLITZENSTEIN: Correct. They were unable
 21 to return it; it's permanent possession; and we acquaint
 22 that with ownership, Your Honor.
 23 THE COURT: So the Government has said that you
 24 have forfeited or waived, one or the other, the argument
 25 that the Government took the right to possess as opposed

50

1 to taking ownership altogether. Is the Government right
 2 about that?
 3 MR. GLITZENSTEIN: I'm sorry, Your Honor. I
 4 didn't follow the question.
 5 THE COURT: So the Government seems to, at
 6 least to some extent, draw a distinction between
 7 ownership and possession or they think that you were
 8 drawing a distinction between ownership and possession.
 9 Are you arguing that -- say are you making an argument
 10 that the Government retaining possession is a taking,
 11 even if you have title in some nominal sense? What if
 12 you still have title in some nominal sense, but the JFK
 13 Records Act says the Government will hold on to it
 14 forever? Are you arguing that that would be a taking?
 15 MR. GLITZENSTEIN: Yes, Your Honor. To me, I
 16 don't see a distinction there whatsoever. Having title
 17 to something but the complete inability to possess it,
 18 handle it, analyze it. As we've said in our complaint,
 19 you know, we're deprived of our ability to do the
 20 sophisticated scientific analysis that is possible in
 21 2024. So there's absolutely -- if you think of it from a
 22 classic bundle of sticks perspective of ownership,
 23 there's no property right of any relevance that would be
 24 left to the Plaintiff in this case if the Government has
 25 permanent possession of the original film. So it's a

51

1 distinction without a difference.
 2 I think maybe the discussion between temporary
 3 possession and things like that, but from the perspective
 4 of, you know, precisely what the Government has said in
 5 its motion to dismiss in 2015, that they cannot return
 6 it, effectively preventing NARA from releasing the actual
 7 assassination records in NARA's collection to Plaintiff
 8 or anyone else, there's no material right of ownership
 9 that would be left to the Plaintiff, given the broad
 10 sweep and unbounded-in-time provisions in the 1992 Act.
 11 They have taken -- there's no question about that, about
 12 the fact that the statute effects a taking.
 13 THE COURT: So going back to whether it's a --
 14 the JFK Records Act leads to a transfer of title, I mean,
 15 the Government points out that Public Law 89-318 is very
 16 explicit that it's a transfer of title and ownership, but
 17 the JFK Records Act doesn't have that. How do you
 18 explain that difference? Is there any explanation?
 19 MR. GLITZENSTEIN: I don't have one from, for
 20 example, the legislative history, Your Honor, to offer
 21 the Court. I mean, I think, though, that the established
 22 practice of the Government, you know, on the authority of
 23 the 1992 Record Act where they expressly use that Act to
 24 seize the Zapruder film leaves it beyond genuine dispute
 25 that that Act had the effect of authorizing the

52

1 Government to acquire private property. It's the way
 2 it's been enforced and it's been endorsed in that exact
 3 sense by the Department of Justice.
 4 THE COURT: So essentially you don't need the
 5 magic words, you look at the substance and what's
 6 happened.
 7 MR. GLITZENSTEIN: I would be concerned if
 8 there needed to be magic words. I think, you know,
 9 statutes often have consequences that, you know, that may
 10 not be -- well, I don't -- I don't want to speak broadly
 11 to statutes, but I don't think that there's any
 12 requirement -- I'm not aware of any requirement that the
 13 Government announce that it is taking private property.
 14 I think you have to look at the substance of what the Act
 15 accomplishes. And we have the most tangible illustration
 16 and the most on-point scenario here with the Zapruder
 17 film. They took private property and they compensated
 18 for it, and the only authority they relied on was the
 19 1992 Act.
 20 THE COURT: Okay. Let's talk about the statute
 21 of limitations now or is there anything about the
 22 substance you'd like to add?
 23 MR. GLITZENSTEIN: If I can just check my
 24 notes, Your Honor. I think that was it, but -- those
 25 were my points, Your Honor, on the statute.

<p>53</p> <p>1 THE COURT: On the statute of limitations, so 2 your response to the Government's motion to dismiss says 3 very little, if anything, about the statute of 4 limitations. What's your response?</p> <p>5 MR. GLITZENSTEIN: Procedurally or on the 6 merits? I mean, the Government framed the issues as 7 12(b)(6) issues as the Court observed and the four 8 questions presented were not directly on the statute, but 9 we certainly want to respond on the merits.</p> <p>10 THE COURT: So are you arguing that the 11 Government concealed its possession of the film or just 12 that you couldn't have known the Government had it?</p> <p>13 MR. GLITZENSTEIN: Well, I think both, Your 14 Honor.</p> <p>15 THE COURT: Both?</p> <p>16 MR. GLITZENSTEIN: To start with the legal 17 point, I think Your Honor was perhaps quoting from the 18 Welcker decision, Federal Circuit, 752 F.2d 1577, which 19 does amplify on this issue of the principle that the 20 accrual rule is strictly and narrowly applied, and they 21 say, "Plaintiff must either show that defendant has 22 concealed acts -- concealed its acts with the result that 23 plaintiff was unaware of their existence or it must show 24 that its injury was inherently unknowable at the accrual 25 date." Both apply. We think both of those apply on the</p>	<p>55</p> <p>1 that my client has been engaging in for decades. You 2 have to ask, and so they asked in 1991, by 3 correspondence. They asked again in 2014 with a formal 4 FOIA request and got the same response, but notably also 5 with a difference. Not only did the Government -- not 6 only did NARA in 2014, in response to that FOIA request 7 say they don't have the film, they also said something 8 else which is very important here. They said we also 9 don't have documents reflecting the chain of custody of 10 the film. That's a critical piece of this case, Your 11 Honor, because there's an enormous amount of information 12 that we're talking about here. It's a needle in a 13 haystack.</p> <p>14 THE COURT: Oh, I can tell you're talking about 15 the visitor logs for this place and that place, right?</p> <p>16 MR. GLITZENSTEIN: And that's the diligence 17 that has been pursued here or with which the film has 18 been pursued, I should say. But the chain of custody, 19 what -- where did the film go and when did it go there? 20 If you're looking for a needle in a haystack -- and that 21 is the exercise here -- you very well need to know the 22 path that the needle took into that haystack. Okay?</p> <p>23 We can't go into the haystack. That's going 24 into NARA. NARA is not a library. We can't go in and 25 open all the doors. We need to know the path. Okay?</p>
<p>54</p> <p>1 facts that we have pleaded here extensively. 2 And, in fact, the Court -- excuse me, the 3 Government, pardon me -- you know, fails to address 4 really the key recent events here that have led to this 5 lawsuit. You know, there's a lot of -- of course, the 6 concealment that we would intend occurred was the 7 categorical response repeatedly from NARA and embraced by 8 the Government that NARA doesn't have the film. We've 9 even heard that, you know, today and in the Government's 10 brief.</p> <p>11 THE COURT: So is that -- that's part of what 12 puzzles me. Yeah, NARA was denying that it had the film 13 in 1991 and it's denied it repeatedly, but then again 14 you've also -- I mean, not you personally, but your 15 client and your client's predecessors have repeatedly 16 dunned the Archives to hand it back. How do you -- if 17 your client did not know that NARA had it, why did NARA 18 sue, for example, to get it back? And if your client 19 predecessor and predecessor-in-interest didn't know that 20 NARA had it, why did your client write to NARA to hand it 21 back in 1991? Those facts are really hard to square with 22 the position that you couldn't have known it.</p> <p>23 MR. GLITZENSTEIN: So with regard to writing to 24 NARA in 1991 and asking for the original film back, 25 there's -- it's part of the overall diligence process</p>	<p>56</p> <p>1 THE COURT: Mm-hmm.</p> <p>2 MR. GLITZENSTEIN: And NARA denied in 2014 3 having any evidence in its records on the chain of 4 custody for the film.</p> <p>5 THE COURT: But then you sued in 2015.</p> <p>6 MR. GLITZENSTEIN: We did. They had the 7 information from Mr. Blakey, who was part of the House 8 Subcommittee, and he had information and that formed the 9 basis for that complaint. But, again, the Government, in 10 its motion to dismiss, again embraced the bottom line 11 assertion from NARA that they don't have the film. That 12 was in the Government's motion to dismiss. So they 13 adopted that. They ratified that representation, okay?</p> <p>14 THE COURT: Well, but then there's the thing 15 with the -- just the facts -- it's not the response to 16 the complaint that bugs me. It's the fact that your 17 client filed it in the first place. I mean, so a rock 18 and a hard place. So the rock is your client knew enough 19 to think that NARA had it and was willing to sue over it 20 and, therefore, had enough knowledge. The hard place is 21 your client raised the allegations without it having 22 knowledge to back them up and violated Rule 11 by filing 23 the thing.</p> <p>24 MR. GLITZENSTEIN: The --</p> <p>25 THE COURT: What's the middle course here?</p>

<p style="text-align: right;">57</p> <p>1 MR. GLITZENSTEIN: The complaint -- I know the 2 Government has characterized this case as being virtually 3 identical -- this case in 20 -- today, in 2204, as being 4 virtually identical to the 2015 case. That is -- these 5 are different cases, Your Honor. 6 And the complaint was actually very 7 categorical, very transparent about its level of 8 knowledge of the film and it's a very different level of 9 knowledge. 10 THE COURT: Spell that out. 11 MR. GLITZENSTEIN: Sure. 12 THE COURT: Show me what the difference is. 13 MR. GLITZENSTEIN: Sure, yeah. So I'm going to 14 talk, Your Honor, about paragraph 6-46 and -50 in the 15 2015 complaint. 16 THE COURT: Okay. On Exhibit 27 we're talking 17 about? 18 MR. GLITZENSTEIN: Confirming, Your Honor. 19 Yes. 20 THE COURT: Okay. I'm on paragraph 6. 21 MR. GLITZENSTEIN: Paragraph 6. Paragraph 6, 22 "The HSCA was last in possession of the original Nix film 23 in 1978, and its whereabouts since has been a mystery." 24 So we didn't allege that NARA had it. They were working 25 with the best information they had based on what they had</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">59</p> <p>1 the original" -- 2 THE COURT: Oh, I'm sorry, I just lost it. 3 MR. GLITZENSTEIN: I apologize, Your Honor. 4 THE COURT: Okay. Paragraph 6, I'm there. 5 MR. GLITZENSTEIN: And I'm looking at the -- 6 it's the second-to-last sentence. 7 THE COURT: Yeah, its whereabouts since has 8 been a mystery. 9 MR. GLITZENSTEIN: Okay. Yeah. So that's -- 10 again, the paragraph following paragraph 5, there's -- 11 you know, that's what they understood at the time. 12 Paragraph 46, Your Honor, and the allegation there, in 13 the second sentence, was "An index of the chain of 14 custody of the original Nix film should have been 15 maintained by the NARA, but it, too, is apparently lost, 16 stolen, or destroyed." 17 THE COURT: It, too? But other than the chain 18 of custody, the film was stolen or destroyed? 19 MR. GLITZENSTEIN: Well, I think it's referring 20 back to the prior paragraph, 45. It's -- it cites -- 21 THE COURT: Oh, I see, I see, okay. So 22 whatever happened is only magnified by the disappearance, 23 construction, or concealment of the Nix film after being 24 in the possession of -- HSCA was the last known 25 possessor.</p>
<p style="text-align: right;">58</p> <p>1 learned recently from Mr. Blakey. 2 THE COURT: No, look at paragraph 5. 3 "Defendant NARA...was in possession and or control of the 4 property requested by Plaintiff which is the subject of 5 this action." Are you really saying that it -- I'll let 6 you keep on going, but that looks like an allegation that 7 NARA has it. 8 MR. GLITZENSTEIN: In 5, Your Honor? 9 THE COURT: Yeah, paragraph 5. Look at the 10 bottom of paragraph 5. NARA is an agency within the 11 meaning of 5 U.S.C. 552 and was in possession and/or 12 control of the property requested by Plaintiff. 13 MR. GLITZENSTEIN: And I think, Your Honor, 14 they were working with the information that they had, but 15 the specifics were fundamentally different in that case. 16 THE COURT: Okay. Keep on walking me through 17 the complaint. If you want to say that the complaint 18 shows that -- your client's predecessor's lack of 19 knowledge, walk me through the complaint. Keep on going. 20 MR. GLITZENSTEIN: Yes, Your Honor. And that 21 is -- I mean, the state of the complaint -- the 22 allegations in the complaint reflect the state of 23 knowledge as being significantly less than what it is on 24 the complaint before this Court. 25 Paragraph 6, "HSCA was last in possession of</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">60</p> <p>1 MR. GLITZENSTEIN: Correct, Your Honor. 2 THE COURT: So what you're saying is that if 3 you look at the details of the allegations here, they're 4 saying that it's not clear, that you weren't actually 5 alleging that NARA had it? 6 MR. GLITZENSTEIN: That's correct, Your Honor. 7 I didn't draft the complaint, so I can't speak to more 8 than what's written on the page, but when I look at the 9 specifics of the allegations, the complaint is very 10 transparent about what it knew. And so it's -- the 11 Plaintiff in this case, Ms. Nix-Jackson, of course, had 12 to work with what she had, but was also very transparent, 13 as I said, about what they knew and it was based on 14 information that they had received recently from Mr. 15 Blakey. But then we get -- the response is denials. We 16 don't have -- NARA says we don't have the film. 17 And this complaint, if you look at the 18 substance of -- or the specifics of the allegation, it 19 never says they did directly, in terms of the -- I mean, 20 they're very transparent about saying, you know, our last 21 known awareness of it is with the House Subcommittee, and 22 that continues in paragraph 50 is the other one. You 23 know, 1998 to present, Plaintiff has attempted to locate 24 the original Nix film with the last known chain of 25 custody of the original Nix film residing with the HSCA</p>

<p style="text-align: right;">61</p> <p>1 to the detriment of the Plaintiff and confirmed in 2015.</p> <p>2 THE COURT: Okay. So what you're saying</p> <p>3 basically is that -- is that this complaint says we've</p> <p>4 tracked it as far as the HSCA. At that point, the trail</p> <p>5 runs dry, so NARA, you're up, you should either hand it</p> <p>6 over or give it back.</p> <p>7 MR. GLITZENSTEIN: I mean, that would be the</p> <p>8 explanation for why paragraph 5 is -- an explanation for</p> <p>9 why paragraph 5 says what it is. But the point here is</p> <p>10 that the Plaintiff's --</p> <p>11 THE COURT: Wait. But then so if they're -- if</p> <p>12 they make this allegation about NARA being in possession</p> <p>13 and/or control of the property, at what point described</p> <p>14 in this complaint was NARA the one that was in possession</p> <p>15 and/or control? Was it before it went over to the HSCA?</p> <p>16 MR. GLITZENSTEIN: I don't believe this</p> <p>17 complaint includes an allegation of any transfer at any</p> <p>18 time to -- from the House to anybody.</p> <p>19 THE COURT: Yeah, but, I mean, when it says</p> <p>20 that NARA was in possession and/or control of the</p> <p>21 property, what does it mean by that? How do you</p> <p>22 reconcile that with the complaint also saying that HSCA</p> <p>23 was the last place it's been tracked to? Is the</p> <p>24 complaint saying that NARA had it before the HSCA or</p> <p>25 what?</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">63</p> <p>1 was, I guess, exposed, the prospect exposed by virtue of</p> <p>2 the information relayed by an Aerospace employee, that</p> <p>3 for the first time revealed that the -- that Aerospace</p> <p>4 had returned the film directly to NARA.</p> <p>5 THE COURT: So, I mean, the chain of custody</p> <p>6 information. Do you cite in your complaint or allege in</p> <p>7 your complaint that NARA has the chain of custody</p> <p>8 information?</p> <p>9 MR. GLITZENSTEIN: Yes, yes, Your Honor, we do.</p> <p>10 THE COURT: Can you point me to that?</p> <p>11 MR. GLITZENSTEIN: Yes. So in general, Your</p> <p>12 Honor -- and I'll turn to the specifics because there are</p> <p>13 three pieces of evidence that I'll speak to, but in</p> <p>14 general this is found in our complaint at paragraphs 1-09</p> <p>15 through 1-29, and just -- those portions of the complaint</p> <p>16 refer back to some of the earlier discussion about the</p> <p>17 chain of custody documents. But I'll -- let me sort of</p> <p>18 start with how all this came into being.</p> <p>19 THE COURT: It's not -- not all that -- I don't</p> <p>20 mind that -- oh, okay, this is what I was asking for,</p> <p>21 like 120, Counsel for Plaintiff contacted NARA --</p> <p>22 MR. GLITZENSTEIN: Yeah, Your Honor, so --</p> <p>23 THE COURT: -- to request emergency</p> <p>24 preservation, including box numbers and file numbers and</p> <p>25 record numbers. Is that what you're talking about?</p>
<p style="text-align: right;">62</p> <p>1 MR. GLITZENSTEIN: I cannot speak to more than</p> <p>2 what is on the face of the complaint, Your Honor.</p> <p>3 THE COURT: Okay.</p> <p>4 MR. GLITZENSTEIN: I apologize for that to the</p> <p>5 Court. I do believe, though -- I will go back to the</p> <p>6 point that this is not -- this is a complaint which was</p> <p>7 based on the best information available at the time,</p> <p>8 which was the information about the House Subcommittee</p> <p>9 and its possession of the film and then, again, being</p> <p>10 very clear about what was known about the chain of</p> <p>11 custody. And that issue, in paragraph 50 -- so the last</p> <p>12 known chain of custody of the original Nix film residing</p> <p>13 with the HSCA, that gets to the concealment aspect here,</p> <p>14 Your Honor. The concealment aspect was not just the</p> <p>15 denial by NARA or the fact that it holds the film, but</p> <p>16 NARA's denial, at that time, that it lacked any records</p> <p>17 with regard to the chain of custody.</p> <p>18 And we know now, as of 2021, that that was</p> <p>19 incorrect. That NARA itself had no idea -- we take them</p> <p>20 at their word, but they had no idea that their own</p> <p>21 records did, in fact, contain critical chain of custody</p> <p>22 evidence.</p> <p>23 THE COURT: And how did you find that out?</p> <p>24 MR. GLITZENSTEIN: Well, a lot of hard work, a</p> <p>25 lot of diligence, but, in particular, sort of the trail</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">64</p> <p>1 MR. GLITZENSTEIN: In part, yes.</p> <p>2 THE COURT: Okay.</p> <p>3 MR. GLITZENSTEIN: But the other allegation in</p> <p>4 our complaint that's new is in 114 and that's the one</p> <p>5 that I was just referring to. A representative of</p> <p>6 Aerospace stated that Aerospace had, in fact, sent the</p> <p>7 Nix film to NARA, not to HSC or UPI, as had been</p> <p>8 previously reported.</p> <p>9 THE COURT: Okay. So what we have is basically</p> <p>10 this chunk of your complaint shows stuff that you think</p> <p>11 should have been disclosed in response to the FOIA</p> <p>12 request. You didn't find out until later and it shows</p> <p>13 that NARA sent it to Aerospace and then you get the</p> <p>14 information from Aerospace saying it was returned to</p> <p>15 NARA.</p> <p>16 MR. GLITZENSTEIN: It shows two things, Your</p> <p>17 Honor.</p> <p>18 THE COURT: Okay.</p> <p>19 MR. GLITZENSTEIN: It shows that. It shows</p> <p>20 that there was, in fact, in NARA's files, important chain</p> <p>21 of custody evidence that -- and it matters, right? If</p> <p>22 you're looking for something and you think I'm going to</p> <p>23 go look to that big collection of files that we got from</p> <p>24 the HSCA or NARA, we go look in our HSCA files and we</p> <p>25 don't see something, you don't know that you're looking</p>

<p style="text-align: right;">65</p> <p>1 in the wrong place. So when you're making a 2 representation that you don't have something, you've got 3 to be looking in the right place. 4 THE COURT: Mm-hmm. 5 MR. GLITZENSTEIN: And so it's really -- it has 6 two levels of import, we submit, Your Honor. One is it's 7 evidence that does reveal now that NARA received the 8 film, okay, not HSCA as had previously been thought back 9 in 2015. Okay? 10 The second point is it also showed us that the 11 representations of the Government could not be 100 12 percent credited. I don't mean any disrespect when I say 13 that, but they're making factual representations about 14 the absence of evidence. And they made two. In 1991 -- 15 they made one in 1991, and they made two in 2014, in 16 response to the FOIA request. And the two were we don't 17 have the film, we don't have any records of chain of 18 custody. We know the second one is wrong now. 19 THE COURT: Mm-hmm. 20 MR. GLITZENSTEIN: That's a critical 21 revelation. We should be entitled, from the perspective 22 of accrual issues and this whole notion of concealment, 23 we should be entitled to take the Government at its word, 24 right? And we shouldn't be faulted for disbelieving the 25 Government. But now we have a tangible and documented</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">67</p> <p>1 mean, it really does, Your Honor, with all respect to the 2 Government's positioning, it flies in the face of what we 3 allege throughout the complaint and document throughout 4 the complaint about learning what we learned in 2014 from 5 Mr. Blakey. 6 THE COURT: If I understand right, this 1991 7 letter was based on a letter from UPI, also 1991, saying 8 UPI is no longer in possession of the Nix film, the 9 United States Government acquired title of the Nix film 10 and the film, which was in UPI's possession, is housed in 11 the National Archives. I mean, that sounds -- how do you 12 distinguish that from what you were told by Aerospace in 13 2021? 14 MR. GLITZENSTEIN: Thank you, Your Honor, for 15 reminding me of this. Yes, at Exhibit 1, we do have the 16 UPI letter to Ms. -- at that time, Gayle Jackson. So the 17 sequence of events here being -- as part of the diligence 18 process, Ms. Jackson reaches out to UPI for the return of 19 the film. UPI says what it says in this letter in 20 Exhibit 1. The film is housed at the National Archives 21 in Washington, D.C. Ms. Nix-Jackson approaches the 22 National Archives and says, I'd like my film, please, and 23 they say, we don't have it. And I think that's that 24 particular episode. And, again, that's an issue -- or 25 that's another example of concealment of the evidence.</p>
<p style="text-align: right;">66</p> <p>1 reason to disbelieve the representations by the 2 Government. 3 THE COURT: Can we talk about the 1991 4 exchange now? So, you know, the Government points me 5 to Exhibit 2. So Ms. Nix writes to the -- writes the 6 National Archives and says this is a -- this letter 7 will serve as an unambiguous request for the return of 8 the original film footage. So that doesn't have the 9 caveats that you pointed me to in the 2015 complaint 10 that says, okay, you've got it, now return it. Why 11 isn't that evidence of knowledge of who had the -- 12 evidence of knowledge that NARA had it in 1991? 13 MR. GLITZENSTEIN: Well, I mean, a complaint is 14 a formal legal document. It's subject to Rule 11 15 considerations. The allegations do need to be, you know, 16 transparent and robust. This is -- I don't think we have 17 any record of what the telephone conversation was. I 18 mean, I could imagine that it was suggested that the 19 letter be phrased in this way, but this is an informal 20 request. It's a demand, sure, but I would say it's not 21 -- it's not being sort of sent under the auspices of a 22 lawyer, for example. It's not a -- it doesn't have that 23 level of -- or that imprimatur of authority. 24 So taking this letter and that one statement 25 and saying, ha, you must have known at that time -- I</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">68</p> <p>1 And, I mean, I would add that even the 2 Government, in its arguments here in this motion, doesn't 3 seem to suggest that any accrual should begin with these 4 events. I mean, they, too, focus on what happened in 5 2015, but obviously -- 6 THE COURT: But, okay, let's -- I mean, I was a 7 little more focused on 2015 than -- now, I'm going to 8 focus on this. 9 MR. GLITZENSTEIN: Yeah. 10 THE COURT: So let's draw the parallels between 11 1991 and 2021. It seems like in both -- on both 12 occasions, somebody writes to the then owner of the Nix 13 film and says, yeah, I know you're looking for it, we 14 don't have it, we gave it to NARA. So the parallels 15 seems pretty precise. So what is the difference between 16 1991 and 2021 -- 17 MR. GLITZENSTEIN: Yeah. 18 THE COURT: -- that mean that no accrual took 19 place in 1991? 20 MR. GLITZENSTEIN: Yeah. By 2021, we realized 21 that there was concealment of the material facts. In 22 1991, there was no reason to disbelieve the 23 representations made by NARA. And so that is the 24 fundamental -- one of the fundamental distinctions. I'll 25 also add that in 20 --</p>

69

1 THE COURT: So do you have authority saying
2 that the Government's denial of a fact like this can
3 delay accrual?
4 MR. GLITZENSTEIN: I think it's a direct
5 application of the Welcker principle. I mean, this is --
6 THE COURT: I'm not talking about an
7 application of principle. I'm talking about -- like
8 what's the closest case to this kind of situation where
9 -- okay, where we're trying to figure out when an accrual
10 took place, the Government denies some fact relevant to
11 accrual, and that tolls the accrual until you have more
12 information. Do you have a case like that?
13 MR. GLITZENSTEIN: Not at hand, Your Honor.
14 I'm sorry.
15 THE COURT: Okay. That would be lovely to have
16 because if you could point me to that, then maybe I could
17 follow you as far as distinguishing 1991 from 2021. But
18 if you don't have that, then the circumstances look very
19 similar.
20 MR. GLITZENSTEIN: Well, if I may respond to
21 that, Your Honor, I think they're very different. And we
22 had -- and I think the complaint or I would submit that
23 the complaint for all of its, what I would submit, is
24 rigor, I think, does establish a level of understanding
25 that goes far beyond the preliminary investigative

70

1 diligence that was being done in 1991.
2 And it is a matter of parsing the handwritten
3 notes and noting in the photo control log that the HSCA
4 maintained, parsing those notes and seeing that the Nix
5 and Muchmore films went out the door to California, but
6 only the Muchmore film was returned to HSCA. It's that
7 level of understanding that allows -- allowed the
8 Plaintiff to form a -- the -- at least some answers to
9 the mystery that they identify explicitly in their 2015
10 complaint.
11 THE COURT: So -- okay.
12 MR. GLITZENSTEIN: And I would add, Your Honor,
13 it really -- what I see to be a -- and I would submit is
14 a very important factor here is in 2021, we had clear
15 demonstrable evidence that the Government's
16 representations couldn't be taken at face value.
17 THE COURT: Yeah, but that only matters if the
18 Government denial is enough to toll accrual.
19 MR. GLITZENSTEIN: I would submit, Your Honor,
20 that that is --
21 THE COURT: It -- yeah --
22 MR. GLITZENSTEIN: If that's not concealment of
23 acts with the result that Plaintiff was unaware of the
24 existence of an injury, I don't know what is. And if you
25 say -- if you're asked a direct question and you make an

71

1 uncaveated categorical representation that you don't have
2 certain things and then you're shown to have those
3 things, that's a concealment.
4 THE COURT: I mean, maybe you're right. I'd
5 just like authority that backs you up on it. You
6 understand?
7 MR. GLITZENSTEIN: Understood, Your Honor,
8 yeah.
9 THE COURT: And if the -- I mean, there's lots
10 of things that make logical sense in the abstract that
11 don't turn out to be borne out by the case law. So I get
12 the distinction in theory. It would just be nice to have
13 -- to test it with what the case law says.
14 MR. GLITZENSTEIN: Understood, Your Honor.
15 THE COURT: So when -- going to kind of the
16 diligence of the search, when did ONF or its predecessors
17 first contact Aerospace about, you know, what Aerospace
18 had done with the film?
19 MR. GLITZENSTEIN: I don't believe the date
20 of first contact is in the complaint. May I confer on
21 that --
22 THE COURT: I don't think it was in the
23 complaint either.
24 MR. GLITZENSTEIN: If I could confer for a
25 moment, I can --

72

1 THE COURT: I don't think -- well, if it's not
2 in the complaint, it's not in the complaint, but that
3 strikes me as going to diligence. If you've got these --
4 got various actors involved, you've got the HSCA, you've
5 got NARA, you've got UPI, you've maybe got one or two
6 others, and one of them is Aerospace. If people had
7 awareness of Aerospace's analysis at some point earlier,
8 but your client or its predecessors didn't contact
9 Aerospace until later, that would go to diligence
10 potentially.
11 MR. GLITZENSTEIN: Potentially. I can imagine
12 how the Government might argue that, but just --
13 THE COURT: I'm not sure they have argued that.
14 I'm just kind of thinking about it.
15 MR. GLITZENSTEIN: Just to note one aspect that
16 is in the complaint --
17 THE COURT: Okay.
18 MR. GLITZENSTEIN: -- and that is the House
19 Subcommittee, the final report erroneously stated that
20 the Nix film had been subject to digital --
21 THE COURT: At Los Alamos.
22 MR. GLITZENSTEIN: At Los Alamos, right. So
23 even that required some level of sleuthing, if you will,
24 to determine that actually it was Aerospace Corporation,
25 a different state, a different company, right?

73

1 THE COURT: Mm-hmm.

2 MR. GLITZENSTEIN: And there were three
3 entities that were doing that digital -- I don't know if
4 you call it a forensic analysis, but digital analysis of
5 the original films and so -- the other one being San
6 Diego State, I think. So even the notion that there was
7 a -- sort of a trail of breadcrumbs here to follow is not
8 borne out by the basic facts.

9 And this does go to the other aspect of the
10 test in Welcker, I mean, you know, showing that the
11 existence of the injury was inherently unknowable. This
12 is a very challenging exercise for an outsider to do. As
13 I said, we don't have the luxury of being able to go
14 through the stacks, you know, and that's -- so all of
15 this has to be reconstructed from conversations. And I
16 actually -- I don't think that, in hindsight, anything
17 here looks easy, but in hindsight, most things look easy,
18 but it wasn't.

19 And that's why the complaint --

20 THE COURT: It's on a shelf next to the Ark of
21 the Covenant or something.

22 MR. GLITZENSTEIN: I was going to do the
23 Raiders of the Lost Ark analogy, but I --

24 THE COURT: I beat you to it.

25 MR. GLITZENSTEIN: -- was resisting.

74

1 THE COURT: So another line relevant to this
2 Aerospace thing that kind of puzzled me, you said, in
3 paragraph 14 -- 1-14 of your complaint, you said, "It had
4 been previously reported that Aerospace sent the original
5 to HSC or UPI," but what were those previous reports and
6 are they described in the complaint?

7 MR. GLITZENSTEIN: I'm looking, Your Honor, at
8 the discussion of the work of Aerospace that's recited in
9 paragraph 21, and I'm looking for -- oh --

10 THE COURT: If it's not coming to mind, it's
11 okay. I'm just trying to understand that particular
12 line.

13 MR. GLITZENSTEIN: And I'm looking as well,
14 Your Honor, at the information that was received from Mr.
15 Blakey --

16 THE COURT: Mm-hmm.

17 MR. GLITZENSTEIN: -- which, as recounted, you
18 know, in the complaint, that HSCA did have possession of
19 the original Nix film, not merely a copy. But, of
20 course, that's silent on the issue of whether that was
21 before or after the Aerospace work.

22 THE COURT: Okay.

23 MR. GLITZENSTEIN: So it is -- with apologies,
24 Your Honor, it's not immediately coming to mind.

25 THE COURT: Okay. So two more issues with the

75

1 statute of limitations.

2 MR. GLITZENSTEIN: Yep.

3 THE COURT: So one is -- I know you're aware of
4 In re Connick and that -- were you aware of the ARRB-
5 issued regulations implementing the JFK Records Act?

6 MR. GLITZENSTEIN: Not until Your Honor
7 mentioned that. I did have a look at the reference to
8 that. I have not reviewed those regulations other than
9 to note the characterization of the regulations as
10 extending to all assassination records whether private or
11 public.

12 THE COURT: Yeah, yeah, exactly.

13 MR. GLITZENSTEIN: That was the
14 characterization, but I haven't read the regulations to
15 confirm that characterization, Your Honor.

16 THE COURT: Okay. So it defined assassination
17 records to include all records public or private -- and
18 private and that assassinations could be found under the
19 control of persons who have themselves created or have
20 obtained such records. So what comes to mind is if
21 that's right, then it could be that the -- and if those
22 are valid, obviously, then the JFK Records Act and its
23 implementing -- together with its implementing
24 regulations could, by the operation of law, transfer to
25 government ownership items that aren't just in the

76

1 Government's possession, but items that are in the
2 possession of other individuals. And it seems at least
3 arguable that the In re Connick case from the 5th Circuit
4 endorses that, because when the Government came to New
5 Orleans looking for the New Orleans District Parish
6 Attorney's records, the 5th Circuit said, okay, you have
7 to fork them over.

8 So if that's right, then it wouldn't have
9 mattered where the Nix tape was in 1992 and, you know,
10 the statute of limitations would have started running
11 regardless of exactly where the film was.

12 I'm just -- the reason I bring it up is because
13 this is obviously jurisdiction. I had to think it
14 through myself. And the parties didn't raise this issue
15 with the implementing regulation, so I have to bring it
16 up.

17 MR. GLITZENSTEIN: The premise, I believe, of
18 the question is also that the Government did possess the
19 film.

20 THE COURT: No, no, the premise of the question
21 is that the film wasn't in government hands at all, but
22 that the JFK Records Act, as implemented by the -- by the
23 ARRB regulations would have said that it was government
24 property even if it wasn't in the Government's
25 possession.

<p style="text-align: right;">77</p> <p>1 MR. GLITZENSTEIN: Well, then if that -- I 2 think pursuant to those regulations that there should 3 have been takings -- there should have been a valuation 4 proceeding accompanying the taking and that's the -- 5 THE COURT: Well, but that's what this Court 6 does. What this Court does is if there has been a taking 7 and there has not been a valuation proceeding, you can 8 come here to get your money. But that's why we have a 9 statute of limitations. The statute of limitations says 10 if there's a taking and there hasn't been a Zapruder 11 style evaluation proceeding, time starts running, you 12 have to come here. 13 MR. GLITZENSTEIN: The -- 14 THE COURT: The valuation proceeding isn't what 15 creates the taking. The valuation proceeding is 16 something that's required upon a taking, but if you want 17 to get it from here, you need to move. 18 MR. GLITZENSTEIN: Understood. The point I was 19 trying to make is that I haven't read the regulations. 20 So I'm -- but I do see the application of the regulations 21 in the context of the Zapruder film and it did have -- it 22 had both. So the property owner in that case knew that 23 the Government was taking his property. And so -- and as 24 a consequence -- and, again, I'm assuming that the 25 regulations provide for the valuation as an adjunct to</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">79</p> <p>1 sua sponte, then proceed to the Court of Claims. 2 But there's a third scenario which is does it 3 even exist, you know, has it been lost to time. And, I 4 mean, that was one of the -- you know, one of the 5 allegations in the 2015 complaint. It's a mystery where 6 it is. And the HSCA -- you know, they say the last known 7 whereabouts was with the HSCA. The HSCA was disbanded in 8 1979. There's 13 years between that and NARA -- that and 9 the JFK Records Act. 10 So you don't know. I mean, if you don't know 11 that the Government has your property and a statute is 12 promulgated that impacts your ownership of that property, 13 I would submit there's no way that you would know to 14 bring a takings claim. 15 THE COURT: Okay. I mean, do you have 16 authority on that particular point, that if you don't 17 know -- if there's a question about where the property is 18 and what its disposition has been, do you have authority 19 saying that that tolls an accrual of a -- and, I mean, 20 not tolling, but it delays accrual of the taking claim? 21 MR. GLITZENSTEIN: Other than the statement of 22 law in Martinez and Welcker, nothing on that particular 23 fact pattern sort of at this moment. 24 THE COURT: Suppose it had been lost in 25 government possession, is that the difference between a</p>
<p style="text-align: right;">78</p> <p>1 the taking. So they did both in that -- 2 THE COURT: So the regulations, as I read them, 3 they actually don't mention valuation. 4 MR. GLITZENSTEIN: They don't? Okay. 5 THE COURT: They don't look like the 1965 law. 6 It just purports to, again, at least arguably, extend the 7 definition of assassination records more broadly than 8 just the assassination records that are in the 9 Government's hands as of 1992. And if that's right, then 10 -- I mean, the other step of this is that even if the 11 Government doesn't notify you that your -- that, hey, 12 this thing that you have, it's ours now, you know, 13 everyone's presumably on notice of what the law says. 14 And if there's a law that's validly enacted that 15 transfers the property, you're on notice, at least 16 arguably. 17 MR. GLITZENSTEIN: So there are three 18 scenarios. One is the Government already has possession, 19 which is something that until 2021 we didn't -- didn't 20 know. There's a scenario where it's being held 21 privately, which was not the scenario here, but it is the 22 Zapruder situation. In that case, when the Government 23 does come to take possession, it's clear that the 24 Government has done so and now that party is on notice. 25 If the Government doesn't undertake the valuation process</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">80</p> <p>1 taking and a tort? I mean, it could still be a taking if 2 the Government assumed ownership of it and then it was 3 destroyed, I suppose. What if the Government didn't have 4 ownership of it and then lost it, then it would be a -- 5 then that would be a tort, right? 6 MR. GLITZENSTEIN: I would need to research 7 that, Your Honor, but it sounds like a tort if they 8 didn't have ownership and they were negligent in handling 9 and it was within the scope of their -- I mean, there's a 10 lot of caveats on tort claims, but -- 11 THE COURT: Yeah, exactly. I mean, you haven't 12 researched the issue, but I'm thinking about your third 13 scenario about it might have been lost, and if it might 14 have been lost, then that carries its own set of 15 obligations. 16 MR. GLITZENSTEIN: Your Honor, I mean, that 17 third scenario, that is what NARA represented to the 18 Plaintiff's predecessor, Ms. Nix-Jackson -- 19 THE COURT: In 1992? 20 MR. GLITZENSTEIN: In 1991, right. 21 THE COURT: I'm sorry, in 1991. 22 MR. GLITZENSTEIN: So if -- but if you consider 23 those three scenarios, I mean, this is an outsider 24 looking -- trying to get a glimpse into a very 25 complicated apparatus of both, you know, documents and</p>

<p style="text-align: right;">81</p> <p>1 videos moving across the country and being stored in 2 multiple different places and they're told -- she is told 3 expressly it doesn't -- we don't have it, and if there's 4 -- and if UPI says NARA's got it and NARA says they don't 5 have it, that is the third scenario. 6 So from the Plaintiff's -- considering things 7 from the Plaintiff's perspective, it may not be in the 8 Government's possession. It could be in possession of 9 another private company. It could be -- as the complaint 10 alleges, I mean, we've contacted eight other news 11 organizations. Did they somehow acquire it? That 12 reflects the very real consideration as part of the 13 diligence process here over many decades that, of course, 14 this is a newsworthy important piece of historical 15 information, maybe ABC has it. That's another private 16 party. 17 So in that span of years, could that have 18 happened? Sure. Is that actually consistent with the 19 narrative that the Plaintiff was being told in 1992? 20 Absolutely. So you've got to go look at all these other 21 places. 22 Sure, ultimately -- ultimately, the road led 23 back to Rome, but it didn't have to lead back to Rome. 24 It could have been in private hands. 25 I mean, for example --</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">83</p> <p>1 MR. GLITZENSTEIN: Depending. 2 THE COURT: Okay. 3 MR. GLITZENSTEIN: And this is the -- depending 4 on whether the Government possessed the material -- and I 5 use the term "possession" there deliberately, in the 6 broad sense. Did it possess the information prior to 7 1992 or did it identify things after 1992, as in the case 8 of Zapruder, and say I wanted to do that? 9 So counterfactually, if the Government had 10 identified that ABC -- or ABC does a documentary on the 11 assassination, again, hypothetically, and they say we 12 have the original Nix film and we've analyzed it and the 13 Government says, we're taking that, well, we would 14 clearly be on notice and we would go in and we would 15 challenge ABC's asserted ownership of the original film. 16 There would be that discussion. But we would be aware of 17 that by virtue of the Government's exercise of that 18 authority. 19 THE COURT: But then -- no, I think you aren't 20 distinguishing a couple of things. I mean, there are 21 laws that -- there are situations where property is 22 transferred from one hand -- from one set of hands to 23 another set of hands by operation of law. The process 24 for moving it physically from one set of hands to the 25 other set of hands, that's a separate process that might</p>
<p style="text-align: right;">82</p> <p>1 THE COURT: And if it were in private hands, 2 you'd have at least potentially the effect of the 3 regulations saying -- I mean, here's the thing. I mean, 4 think about it from the perspective of a property owner 5 who's trying to get something -- get something back. If 6 a regulation comes out saying this particular piece of 7 property belongs to the Government wherever it can be 8 found, I mean, at least arguably that puts the property 9 owner on notice that even if I don't have it, even if the 10 Government doesn't have it, whoever has it, it's going to 11 belong to the Government now and that's -- and that would 12 be notice of a taking dating from when the regulations 13 come out, at least arguably. I don't know if that's born 14 out, but -- 15 MR. GLITZENSTEIN: Well, Your Honor, I would 16 submit there would be notice of the taking at the time 17 when the Government decides to exercise that authority, 18 as it did in Zapruder. 19 THE COURT: And that -- 20 MR. GLITZENSTEIN: And so -- 21 THE COURT: But, I mean -- but, I mean, there's 22 a question -- I mean, I think your argument has been that 23 the JFK Records Act means a transfer of property just by 24 operation of law and not by any additional act being 25 necessary.</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">84</p> <p>1 involve some legal procedure. But what I'm pointing out 2 -- and who knows, the parties haven't developed it 3 particularly, but who knows if that wasn't the situation 4 with the -- with the Zapruders. You could have -- the 5 fact that the Government may have needed to go through a 6 certain kind of process to seize a certain thing, it 7 doesn't say anything about -- or it doesn't dispose of 8 the question of whether title had been transferred by 9 operation of law separately. You need to distinguish the 10 legal effect of a law on ownership from the process -- 11 from the Government asserting the ownership. 12 And if ownership has been transferred by 13 operation of law, then I would think that that's -- that 14 that's -- starts the talking even before the Government 15 asserts it. You know, I don't know for sure if that's 16 what the case law bears out, but the parties haven't 17 developed the issue, which is why it's -- which is why it 18 would have been nice to have development of the effect of 19 these regulations. 20 Related to that, by the way, so as you know, 21 typically, the owner of a property at the time of a 22 physical taking retains the claim and doesn't transfer 23 the claim when it conveys the property to a new owner, 24 right? I mean, that's been the law for, you know, quite 25 some time. Are you familiar with that rule?</p>

<p style="text-align: right;">85</p> <p>1 MR. GLITZENSTEIN: I am not, Your Honor.</p> <p>2 THE COURT: I mean, the Government cites it in</p> <p>3 their briefing in a footnote, I believe. (Document</p> <p>4 review.) Yeah, that's --</p> <p>5 MR. GLITZENSTEIN: Footnote 4?</p> <p>6 THE COURT: Yeah, Footnote 4, right. Do you</p> <p>7 have a view on that?</p> <p>8 MR. GLITZENSTEIN: I do not at this time, Your</p> <p>9 Honor.</p> <p>10 THE COURT: Okay. I mean, I don't know how</p> <p>11 that rule interacts with the claim accrual rules, but,</p> <p>12 you know, the problem is out there.</p> <p>13 When did ONF acquire the Nix tape?</p> <p>14 MR. GLITZENSTEIN: May I take a moment, Your</p> <p>15 Honor, and confirm?</p> <p>16 THE COURT: Okay.</p> <p>17 (Pause in the proceedings.)</p> <p>18 MR. GLITZENSTEIN: Your Honor, I'm advised</p> <p>19 that that was in 2021.</p> <p>20 THE COURT: Okay. So unless that rule about</p> <p>21 transfer of property and takings and unless the claim</p> <p>22 accrual rule applies in that situation, you've got</p> <p>23 another kind of problem with whether ONF is the proper</p> <p>24 party to assert this claim.</p> <p>25 MR. GLITZENSTEIN: I would want to look at</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">87</p> <p>1 THE COURT: Yeah.</p> <p>2 MR. KUSHNIR: -- and maybe come to a more</p> <p>3 informed position on the issue. But what I wanted to say</p> <p>4 is that I think the way the National Archives views the</p> <p>5 JFK Records Act is that it provides an option of what to</p> <p>6 do when the Government has a record of the assassination</p> <p>7 in its possession. It can keep the record, take it under</p> <p>8 the 5th Amendment, and then provide compensation under</p> <p>9 the 5th Amendment, or it can return that record back to</p> <p>10 its owner. And that's what happened --</p> <p>11 THE COURT: The JFK Records Act, so it gives</p> <p>12 the Government a choice about what to do?</p> <p>13 MR. KUSHNIR: Right, sort of discretion. And</p> <p>14 that's what happened with the Zapruder film as well. If</p> <p>15 we look at the exhibit that my friend on the other side</p> <p>16 pointed to -- so Exhibit 37 to the complaint, page 2,</p> <p>17 that's the place where it says the ARRB directed that the</p> <p>18 Zapruder film be transferred to the Records Collection</p> <p>19 within the National Archives and Records Administration.</p> <p>20 So that's an act that the Government affirmatively took</p> <p>21 in order to appropriate the film. But right before that,</p> <p>22 it says something that's also important.</p> <p>23 It says, "In 1978, LMH," which was the</p> <p>24 corporate entity that had title to the Zapruder film at</p> <p>25 the time, "deposited the film with the National Archives</p>
<p style="text-align: right;">86</p> <p>1 that, Your Honor.</p> <p>2 THE COURT: Of course.</p> <p>3 MR. GLITZENSTEIN: Thank you.</p> <p>4 THE COURT: Okay. I don't think I have</p> <p>5 anything else for you at the moment. Is there anything</p> <p>6 else you'd like to raise or amplify?</p> <p>7 I'd like to give Mr. Kushnir a short chance to</p> <p>8 reply, but I want to make sure that you have your</p> <p>9 opportunity, too.</p> <p>10 MR. GLITZENSTEIN: Just reading my notes, Your</p> <p>11 Honor.</p> <p>12 THE COURT: Of course.</p> <p>13 (Pause in the proceedings.)</p> <p>14 MR. GLITZENSTEIN: I have nothing further, Your</p> <p>15 Honor. Thank you.</p> <p>16 THE COURT: All right. Mr. Kushnir?</p> <p>17 MR. KUSHNIR: Thank you, Your Honor. I'll try</p> <p>18 to be brief, hopefully.</p> <p>19 I'll start by saying something briefly about</p> <p>20 the JFK Assassination Records Act. I don't want to</p> <p>21 belabor the point because I think it's, number one,</p> <p>22 secondary to the timeliness issue. That's a jurisdiction</p> <p>23 issue and the Court can resolve it without really delving</p> <p>24 into the JFK Records Act. But, number two, I do want to</p> <p>25 look at that 5th Circuit case that the Court mentioned --</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">88</p> <p>1 and Records Administration for storage and safekeeping."</p> <p>2 So what we have is a situation in which the National</p> <p>3 Archives has the Zapruder film for it looks like about a</p> <p>4 decade and then, at some point, they decide to</p> <p>5 appropriate that film for the Government. And so they</p> <p>6 take an affirmative act to appropriate the film and then</p> <p>7 end up paying just compensation for that appropriation.</p> <p>8 That's what we're lacking here.</p> <p>9 What we're lacking, even if we assume for a</p> <p>10 moment under the hypothetical that the Government</p> <p>11 continues to possess the film, what we are lacking is an</p> <p>12 affirmative act to appropriate the film. If the National</p> <p>13 Archives were to discover tomorrow all of a sudden that,</p> <p>14 you know what, maybe there's a box no one looked at, as</p> <p>15 unlikely as that is, and there we go, the film is right</p> <p>16 there, then they would have a choice. They could release</p> <p>17 it back to the heirs of Mr. Nix or they could decide to</p> <p>18 appropriate it for the Government, take some affirmative</p> <p>19 action to take the film and then they'd have to pay just</p> <p>20 compensation.</p> <p>21 THE COURT: Can you point me to what in the JFK</p> <p>22 Records Act creates that choice?</p> <p>23 MR. KUSHNIR: There's nothing specific that</p> <p>24 I've found in the JFK Records Act.</p> <p>25 THE COURT: Oh, goodness. So where are you</p>

<p style="text-align: right;">89</p> <p>1 getting this interpretation from?</p> <p>2 MR. KUSHNIR: Well, that's the way the National</p> <p>3 Archives and Records Administration understands the Act</p> <p>4 because there is no language of appropriation in the Act.</p> <p>5 So it doesn't look like the Act, by itself, without</p> <p>6 anything else, appropriates property for the Government.</p> <p>7 THE COURT: Wait, where -- as I read it, it</p> <p>8 says, "The collection shall consist of record copies of</p> <p>9 all government records relating to the assassination</p> <p>10 which shall be transmitted to the National Archives and</p> <p>11 the collection shall include all assassination records."</p> <p>12 Where here gives the Archives the discretion to do</p> <p>13 anything with assassination records other than just</p> <p>14 gather it and keep it? What part of this Act allows the</p> <p>15 Archives to release anything to anybody?</p> <p>16 MR. KUSHNIR: There's nothing specific in the</p> <p>17 Act --</p> <p>18 THE COURT: Okay. So where is this</p> <p>19 interpretation --</p> <p>20 MR. KUSHNIR: -- to that effect.</p> <p>21 THE COURT: -- of yours coming from? I don't</p> <p>22 mean to be impatient with you -- with you, I just</p> <p>23 wondered.</p> <p>24 MR. KUSHNIR: Yeah, and I think it comes from</p> <p>25 this idea that the Government can appropriate records.</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">91</p> <p>1 possession of the various entities is an assassination</p> <p>2 record and that all the assassination records go to the</p> <p>3 Archives. Is this the distinction you're drawing between</p> <p>4 title and possession?</p> <p>5 MR. KUSHNIR: I suppose in a way it is.</p> <p>6 THE COURT: Okay. So cut through all of that.</p> <p>7 Suppose -- possession is one of the bundled rights of</p> <p>8 property, right, and if you take -- and if you take</p> <p>9 possession now and in perpetuity as to a particular piece</p> <p>10 of property, you've taken one of the sticks in the bundle</p> <p>11 of property rights for that piece of property, right?</p> <p>12 MR. KUSHNIR: Yes.</p> <p>13 THE COURT: Okay.</p> <p>14 MR. KUSHNIR: If you do that, then yes.</p> <p>15 THE COURT: Right. So even if the JFK Records</p> <p>16 Act isn't a taking, isn't a taking of title, would you</p> <p>17 agree that it's a taking of possessory rights as to any</p> <p>18 piece of property that's -- that would be privately owned</p> <p>19 and is defined as an assassination record under the Act.</p> <p>20 MR. KUSHNIR: It can be, yes.</p> <p>21 THE COURT: Okay. So then what -- then I don't</p> <p>22 know why we would be arguing about title if there's a --</p> <p>23 they released a taking of the right of possession.</p> <p>24 MR. KUSHNIR: Well, because I don't think</p> <p>25 possession and ownership are synonymous in this</p>
<p style="text-align: right;">90</p> <p>1 It doesn't need statutory authority to do that. It can</p> <p>2 appropriate records under the 5th Amendment and has</p> <p>3 constitutional authority to do that. It needs to do</p> <p>4 something in order to effectuate that appropriation. It</p> <p>5 needs to take an affirmative act.</p> <p>6 THE COURT: Well, sometimes just passing a law</p> <p>7 can transfer ownership of property from one party to</p> <p>8 another without any subsequent decision.</p> <p>9 MR. KUSHNIR: It can be, but that's not what</p> <p>10 the JFK Records Act is.</p> <p>11 THE COURT: Why not?</p> <p>12 MR. KUSHNIR: Because it doesn't have that</p> <p>13 language of appropriation. It says nothing about --</p> <p>14 THE COURT: But you don't need magic words, do</p> <p>15 you?</p> <p>16 MR. KUSHNIR: Well, you may not need magic</p> <p>17 words, but you need some words. You need some indication</p> <p>18 that title or rights or ownership will be transferred</p> <p>19 from someone else to the Government and there's nothing</p> <p>20 like that in the JFK Records Act. There's no discussion</p> <p>21 of title or rights or ownership, nothing like what we see</p> <p>22 in the 1965 Act.</p> <p>23 THE COURT: Oh, well, it says everything --</p> <p>24 everything that came into the -- created or made</p> <p>25 available for use or attained by or otherwise came into</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">92</p> <p>1 situation.</p> <p>2 THE COURT: But they don't have to be</p> <p>3 synonymous in this situation. A possessory right isn't</p> <p>4 nothing and it has -- the right of possession, that's the</p> <p>5 thing that's valuable about the Nix film, I would think.</p> <p>6 So if what you're saying is -- I mean, if, in substance,</p> <p>7 what -- you're saying, oh, it's not a taking of title,</p> <p>8 it's just a taking of possession, and if not for the</p> <p>9 statute of limitations argument, the case would be going</p> <p>10 forward, wouldn't it?</p> <p>11 MR. KUSHNIR: Well, Your Honor, I'd submit that</p> <p>12 possession is not the only thing that's valuable about</p> <p>13 the Nix film.</p> <p>14 THE COURT: It doesn't have to be the only</p> <p>15 thing valuable. It has to be one thing that's valuable,</p> <p>16 right? I mean, take the recent Supreme Court decision</p> <p>17 about the right of exclusion. The name is escaping me at</p> <p>18 the moment.</p> <p>19 MR. KUSHNIR: Cedar Point.</p> <p>20 THE COURT: Cedar Point, that's right.</p> <p>21 Something about trees. I mean, the Government wasn't</p> <p>22 taking all of the right, it was just taking the right to</p> <p>23 exclude and that's enough to make it -- to -- if that's</p> <p>24 enough for a takings case to go forward based on</p> <p>25 appropriation by the Government of that one stick in the</p>

<p style="text-align: right;">93</p> <p>1 bundle of property rights, why wouldn't a taking of the 2 possessory rights be enough, too? 3 MR. KUSHNIR: So, Your Honor, I'd suggest that 4 Cedar Point is not directly on point because it relates 5 to real property. When it comes to land, the analysis is 6 a little different, which is what it was in Cedar Point. 7 When it comes to personal property, an item that the 8 Government takes possession of, I think we need to look 9 at the entire bundle of rights, at everything that this 10 property has to offer in order to figure out whether 11 taking one stick in that bundle amounts to a taking under 12 the 5th Amendment. 13 THE COURT: Okay. But do you have a -- 14 MR. KUSHNIR: It's a bit more complex. 15 THE COURT: -- do you have a case 16 distinguishing real and personal property in that regard? 17 MR. KUSHNIR: Nothing that comes to mind 18 immediately, but there are Federal Circuit cases that 19 talk about a situation in which only one stick is taken 20 out of the bundle of rights, and I'm thinking, for 21 instance, of the fishing cases, like <i>Conti v. United</i> 22 <i>States</i>. Those are takings cases, regulatory taking so 23 it's a little different, as you pointed out correctly. 24 THE COURT: A completely different world. 25 MR. KUSHNIR: Right.</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">95</p> <p>1 for supplemental briefing. I do want to read that 5th 2 Circuit case that the Court mentioned. 3 So if you would, Your Honor, I'd like to switch 4 gears to the timeliness issue -- 5 THE COURT: Okay. Okay. 6 MR. KUSHNIR: -- which is -- the good news 7 there is that the Court doesn't really need to go into 8 the JFK Records Act because timeliness is a separate and 9 distinct reason why the Court can dismiss and should 10 dismiss the case on jurisdictional grounds at the outset. 11 So I'd like to start with the Court's -- one of the first 12 questions that the Court posed to my friend on the other 13 side, which is can Plaintiff pinpoint the specific 14 government act that gave rise to a takings claim? 15 And I think what my colleague said is that the 16 preexisting possession -- so possessing the Nix film 17 prior to the enactment of the JFK Records Act, plus the 18 enactment of the Act itself, combined are the act that 19 gave rise to the taking in this case. 20 So I think to start we need to parse that out 21 because the Federal Circuit has said time and again that 22 Plaintiff cannot come in and allege a number of different 23 acts and say that in combination they amount to a taking. 24 THE COURT: I don't think that's what the 25 Plaintiff is arguing. I think they're saying in the</p>
<p style="text-align: right;">94</p> <p>1 THE COURT: But I -- plus, I mean, I think 2 Cedar Point kind of reorganizes the world a little bit in 3 that regard. 4 MR. KUSHNIR: It did, but, again, it's land, 5 and I think land is treated -- 6 THE COURT: Okay. 7 MR. KUSHNIR: -- a little differently. When 8 you have a -- you know, you have a situation like 9 <i>Loretto</i>, that I don't think would come up in a case 10 involving personal property. That's the kind of scenario 11 that can only come up in a case involving the taking of 12 land. So I do think there's a distinction there. 13 THE COURT: Yeah, there's some kinds of 14 physical takings that it's hard to conceptualize in the 15 -- in real versus personal property. But, I mean, 16 suppose -- I mean, we don't need the hypotheticals, but 17 unless you have -- unless you can come back to -- and 18 we'll talk about supplemental briefing, but unless you 19 can come back to me with some -- with some kind of 20 authority saying that taking a stick and a bundle creates 21 a taking claim in the context of real property, but not 22 in personal property, I'd be hard-pressed to draw that 23 distinction for the first time. 24 MR. KUSHNIR: Okay. Well, no, and I appreciate 25 that. Perhaps this is something that's better reserved</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">96</p> <p>1 light of the factual state of the world, this Act was the 2 last piece of the puzzle that made a taking. And that's 3 okay, right? 4 MR. KUSHNIR: I mean, that sounds to me like 5 they're saying the Act -- the enactment of the Act 6 becoming law is the taking in this case. And if that's 7 their theory, that's fine, but in that case, that's when 8 the claim accrued. We can talk about whether the claim 9 should be suspended or not -- 10 THE COURT: Unless accrual is delayed in some 11 way. 12 MR. KUSHNIR: Unless accrual was suspended, 13 absolutely. 14 THE COURT: Yes. 15 MR. KUSHNIR: But as a starting place, we need 16 to find an accrual point. And so the way I understand 17 their claim, that accrual point was in 1992 when the JFK 18 Records Act became law. So that's our starting place for 19 the timeliness analysis. 20 THE COURT: Provided that accrual wasn't 21 suspended, I think that's right. 22 MR. KUSHNIR: Right. So the question then is 23 whether accrual should be suspended. And there was 24 discussion of concealment here, and what I'd like to do, 25 Your Honor, is go back to the <i>Martinez</i> case and read what</p>

<p style="text-align: right;">97</p> <p>1 is required for concealment to be -- to suspend the 2 accrual date. So Martinez 333 F.3d, beginning at 1295, 3 and the specific passage that I'm looking at is at 1319. 4 And what it says -- and I'm going to read a 5 part of a paragraph, not the entire thing -- but it says, 6 "The accrual suspension rule is strictly and narrowly 7 applied: The plaintiff must either show that defendant 8 has concealed its acts with the result that plaintiff was 9 unaware of their existence." And then there's another 10 possible way of suspending accrual that doesn't apply 11 here. 12 So what the Plaintiff has to do here is to show 13 not just concealment. Concealment is a part of it, but 14 they have to show concealment with the result that 15 Plaintiff was unaware of their existence. And that's the 16 sticky part here, because what we have is evidence 17 beginning at 1991, that the Plaintiff or the Plaintiff's 18 predecessor, Ms. Nix-Jackson, believed that the 19 Government possessed the film. 20 THE COURT: So what if the Government was wrong 21 in 1991 when it said all we have is a copy, we don't have 22 the original? Would that count as concealment? 23 MR. KUSHNIR: So the Government was wrong in 24 its representation -- 25 THE COURT: Yeah.</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">99</p> <p>1 It says, well, the last government entity we know of that 2 had the thing is the HSCA and its whereabouts after that 3 is a mystery. That doesn't actually sound a whole lot 4 like the allegations of someone who knows that it could 5 be found in the Archives. 6 MR. KUSHNIR: The complaints only hedged its 7 bets on that factual matter. But what's also important 8 is that the complaint not only had a replevin action to 9 return the film, it also had a takings claim, and it had 10 the same takings claim that is now brought before this 11 Court. So if the Plaintiff had all the information she 12 needed to bring a takings claim in 2015 -- it was brought 13 in the wrong forum and it was dismissed because it was 14 brought in the wrong forum, but it was brought there 15 nonetheless, if she had all the information she needed to 16 bring a takings claim in 2015, how can she then come back 17 in 2023 and say, I didn't have the information I needed 18 until 2021? That doesn't make sense. 19 And the other passage that's very important 20 here, Your Honor, from Martinez, there's a discussion 21 there about that letter from the ex-wife as I mentioned 22 before. 23 THE COURT: Yeah, additional ammunition. 24 MR. KUSHNIR: And -- additional ammunition. 25 The way the Federal Circuit described that letter is</p>
<p style="text-align: right;">98</p> <p>1 MR. KUSHNIR: -- that it only had a copy? 2 THE COURT: Yeah. 3 MR. KUSHNIR: I'm not entirely sure if 4 concealment requires some sort of ill will or some 5 bad faith on the part of the Government. Honestly, I 6 don't -- 7 THE COURT: Okay. Well, then -- right. Well, 8 then your accrual suspension argument has kind of a 9 problem because -- because, you know, one way or the 10 other, the Plaintiff -- the Plaintiff's successor-in- 11 interest wrote to the Government and said, okay, give it 12 back, and the Government said, yeah, we don't have it. 13 Presumably plaintiffs -- you know, property owners have 14 some entitlement to rely on the Government's 15 representation. If the Government says we don't have it, 16 then why shouldn't that delay -- that suspend accrual? 17 MR. KUSHNIR: Well, it doesn't unless the 18 Plaintiff also can show that the result of that 19 concealment was that she was unaware of the existence of 20 the claim. And that's the sticky part here. That's the 21 problem she cannot overcome, because we not only have 22 that 1991 letter, but we also have the 2015 claim also 23 asking the Government to return the film. 24 THE COURT: Yeah, though as your colleague 25 pointed out, the complaint has some ambiguous language.</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">100</p> <p>1 merely additional ammunition for the claim. 2 THE COURT: So the question is whether the 3 representation about Aerospace are additional ammunition 4 for something Plaintiff and its predecessors already knew 5 about or whether it creates something new? 6 MR. KUSHNIR: Exactly. 7 THE COURT: Okay. 8 MR. KUSHNIR: That's exactly right. And based 9 on the allegations in the complaint and the exhibits 10 appended to the complaint, the '91 letter, the 2015 claim 11 in District Court, I think what we can tell is that this 12 was nothing more than additional ammunition, not 13 particularly powerful ammunition either because it 14 doesn't talk about who has the film in 1992. It only 15 talked about the film being returned in 1978. But, you 16 know, perhaps it does provide some additional backing to 17 the idea that the Government possesses the Nix film, but 18 it's nothing more than additional ammunition because we 19 know that the Plaintiff's predecessor maintained this 20 position all along. 21 THE COURT: Okay. Anything you'd like to add? 22 I don't think I have any more questions for you at the 23 moment. 24 MR. KUSHNIR: I have just two more small 25 points, Your Honor.</p>

<p style="text-align: right;">101</p> <p>1 THE COURT: Okay.</p> <p>2 MR. KUSHNIR: I think counsel on the other side</p> <p>3 said at one point that our accrual argument focuses on</p> <p>4 2015. I don't think that's right. Our accrual argument</p> <p>5 doesn't focus on 2015. Our accrual argument is that</p> <p>6 accrual of the claim, which accrued in 1992, was not</p> <p>7 suspended at all. And the reason it was not suspended --</p> <p>8 THE COURT: That's how I understood your</p> <p>9 argument.</p> <p>10 MR. KUSHNIR: Okay, okay. I just wanted to</p> <p>11 clarify.</p> <p>12 The final point I wanted to make, Your Honor,</p> <p>13 is something you brought up and that is the diligence in</p> <p>14 pursuing Aerospace and trying to figure out what</p> <p>15 happened. I agree with you, that's a very important</p> <p>16 point. When we look at Martinez and accrual suspension,</p> <p>17 the standard is knew or should have known. And if the</p> <p>18 Plaintiff should have known earlier that she -- I guess,</p> <p>19 it, ONF, had a claim, then accrual suspension would not</p> <p>20 be appropriate either. So if Plaintiff or Plaintiff's</p> <p>21 predecessor could have gone to Aerospace earlier but</p> <p>22 didn't, I think we would trigger that shown-have-known</p> <p>23 part. But you are absolutely right, we did not make that</p> <p>24 argument in our motion because the complaint didn't</p> <p>25 actually say anything about when Aerospace was contacted.</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">103</p> <p>1 MR. GLITZENSTEIN: And just to be complete, I</p> <p>2 also have a Westlaw cite, 1987 WL 37473.</p> <p>3 THE COURT: Okay.</p> <p>4 MR. GLITZENSTEIN: So it is in the -- it's</p> <p>5 consideration by the Federal Circuit, Your Honor, of the</p> <p>6 accrual issues where the Plaintiff in that action --</p> <p>7 where things have been misrepresented to the Plaintiff in</p> <p>8 that action --</p> <p>9 THE COURT: Okay.</p> <p>10 MR. GLITZENSTEIN: -- why it's important.</p> <p>11 THE COURT: So here's my suggestion. Instead</p> <p>12 of kind of recounting all of the kind of open issues that</p> <p>13 we haven't been able to address definitively, my</p> <p>14 suggestion is that maybe you all might want to order a</p> <p>15 transcript and no reason to rush it, but maybe give you</p> <p>16 30 days, something like that, to do some additional</p> <p>17 thinking and research, maybe supplemental briefs in --</p> <p>18 say no more than 10 pages, 30 days from now, addressing</p> <p>19 maybe supplemental answers to any questions raised at the</p> <p>20 hearing that you think deserve additional attention.</p> <p>21 Would that be helpful to you both?</p> <p>22 MR. GLITZENSTEIN: From Plaintiff's</p> <p>23 perspective, yes, Your Honor. Would this be simultaneous</p> <p>24 briefs?</p> <p>25 THE COURT: Yes, simultaneous.</p>
<p style="text-align: right;">102</p> <p>1 So at this stage, without additional factual</p> <p>2 allegations, we wouldn't be able to make that point. But</p> <p>3 it's certainly something we would pursue were this case</p> <p>4 to go forward.</p> <p>5 THE COURT: Okay. So anything else you'd like</p> <p>6 to add?</p> <p>7 MR. KUSHNIR: Nothing else.</p> <p>8 THE COURT: Okay. So I've got a bunch of</p> <p>9 question marks kind of floating around throughout my</p> <p>10 notes here. I think it would be helpful, if you have a</p> <p>11 chance, to address those.</p> <p>12 Oh, Mr. Glitzenstein, do you have something</p> <p>13 else to say?</p> <p>14 MR. GLITZENSTEIN: Just I wanted to respond to</p> <p>15 one of the questions that Your Honor asked me in terms of</p> <p>16 a citation that I could not provide.</p> <p>17 THE COURT: Okay.</p> <p>18 MR. GLITZENSTEIN: I was reviewing my notes and</p> <p>19 I do have some case authority in the scenario of accrual</p> <p>20 in the context of a government misrepresentation.</p> <p>21 THE COURT: Oh, okay. If you could just read</p> <p>22 me a couple of citations.</p> <p>23 MR. GLITZENSTEIN: Yes, Your Honor. So it's</p> <p>24 the Martin Alvarez v. MSPB case, 824 F.2d 976.</p> <p>25 THE COURT: 824 F.2d 976.</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">104</p> <p>1 MR. GLITZENSTEIN: Yes, Your Honor.</p> <p>2 MR. KUSHNIR: I think that would be helpful,</p> <p>3 Your Honor. My only request is to make it 45 days</p> <p>4 instead of 30. I just know I personally have an argument</p> <p>5 in the Federal Circuit in early March. So I would like</p> <p>6 to have a little bit of time afterwards, if possible.</p> <p>7 THE COURT: Okay. Forty-five days sounds fine,</p> <p>8 too.</p> <p>9 MR. KUSHNIR: Okay.</p> <p>10 THE COURT: Everybody happy with that?</p> <p>11 MR. GLITZENSTEIN: Yes, Your Honor.</p> <p>12 THE COURT: Okay. I won't try to list and</p> <p>13 enumerate all the issues that we left open today. It</p> <p>14 should be clear from a transcript. Are you two willing</p> <p>15 to order a transcript to cover that?</p> <p>16 MR. KUSHNIR: Certainly, Your Honor.</p> <p>17 THE COURT: Great. That sounds good. All</p> <p>18 right. Anything else to talk about?</p> <p>19 MR. GLITZENSTEIN: Nothing from us, Your Honor.</p> <p>20 THE COURT: Okay. Thanks both of you for a</p> <p>21 very helpful argument. Under advisement. I'll look</p> <p>22 forward to the supplemental briefs.</p> <p>23 (Whereupon, at 4:24 p.m., the hearing was</p> <p>24 adjourned.)</p> <p>25</p>

105

1 CERTIFICATE OF TRANSCRIBER

2
3 I, Elizabeth M. Farrell, court-approved
4 transcriber, certify that the foregoing is a correct
5 transcript from the official electronic sound recording
6 of the proceedings in the above-titled matter.
7
8
9

10 DATE: 3/1/2024 S/Elizabeth M. Farrell
11 ELIZABETH M. FARRELL, CERT
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25

A				
a.m 1:17	act 5:21,24 6:9,19	100:1,3,12,16,18	32:3 58:6 59:12	answered 37:20
ABC 81:15 83:10,10	6:25 7:1,4,8,10 9:9	102:1 103:16,20	60:18 61:12,17	39:8
ABC's 83:15	10:1,7,12,18,19,23	address 37:8 40:21	64:3	answers 70:8 103:19
ability 50:19	10:24 11:4,5,13,16	41:15 54:3 102:11	allegations 9:21	anybody 31:16
able 36:3 73:13	12:8 13:1,11,19,21	103:13	13:7 28:6,12,13	61:18 89:15
102:2 103:13	13:22 14:3,8,11,13	addressed 49:10	29:18 36:2 37:10	apologies 74:23
above-titled 105:6	14:24 15:16,21	addressing 37:16	39:14 56:21 58:22	apologize 47:7 59:3
Abraham 19:19	16:6,22,24 17:9	103:18	60:3,9 66:15 79:5	62:4
absence 39:19 65:14	19:8 24:19 28:25	adjourned 104:24	99:4 100:9 102:2	apparatus 80:25
absolutely 36:16	30:15 31:5 36:11	adjunct 77:25	allege 57:24 63:6	apparently 59:15
50:21 81:20 96:13	38:3,4,6 39:2,11	Administration	67:3 95:22	APPEARANCES
101:23	39:11 40:19 41:7	41:24 87:19 88:1	alleged 13:16 15:1	2:1
abstract 71:10	41:11,13 42:9 43:1	89:3	31:8 36:2 46:4	appears 5:19
accompanying 77:4	43:12,24 44:7,9,13	adopted 56:13	allegedly 4:24 44:20	appended 28:7
accomplish 35:2	44:15,21 45:12,19	ADR 19:12,13,15,20	alleges 36:2 81:10	100:10
accomplishes 52:15	46:2,25 47:3 48:10	19:21	alleging 5:20 60:5	application 48:8
account 21:2	48:11,19,21 49:15	advanced 10:4	allowed 70:7	69:5,7 77:20
accrual 7:12,17	49:16 50:13 51:10	advised 85:18	allows 14:8 70:7	applied 53:20 97:7
24:17 25:8,10,11	51:14,17,23,23,25	advisement 104:21	89:14	applies 85:22
26:14 27:4,6,12	52:14,19 75:5,22	Aerospace 7:15 30:8	altogether 50:1	apply 7:18 8:8 9:8
31:3,4 32:3,4,6	76:22 79:9 82:23	30:9,13,25 45:8	Alvarez 102:24	9:15,20 10:24
33:22,24,24 53:20	82:24 86:20,24	63:2,3 64:6,6,13	ambiguity 17:7,10	53:25,25 97:10
53:24 65:22 68:3	87:5,11,20 88:6,12	64:14 67:12 71:17	39:16	appreciate 94:24
68:18 69:3,9,11,11	88:22,24 89:3,4,5	71:17 72:6,9,24	ambiguous 98:25	approached 45:11
70:18 79:19,20	89:14,17 90:5,10	74:2,4,8,21 100:3	Amendment 20:22	approaches 67:21
85:11,22 96:10,12	90:20,22 91:16,19	101:14,21,25	21:13 22:13 87:8,9	appropriate 5:25
96:16,17,20,23	95:8,14,17,18,18	Aerospace's 72:7	90:2 93:12	6:21 7:1 14:25
97:2,6,10 98:8,16	96:1,5,5,18	affidavit 46:6 47:14	AMERICA 1:7	19:24 21:12 22:6
101:3,4,5,6,16,19	Act's 46:12	affirmative 19:24	ammunition 99:23	23:18 24:20 31:6
102:19 103:6	action 5:15,18 13:15	21:11 22:5 23:2,6	99:24 100:1,3,12	87:21 88:5,6,12,18
accrued 12:25 24:14	19:9,23 20:6 21:11	23:9 88:6,12,18	100:13,18	89:25 90:2 101:20
96:8 101:6	21:15,17,19 22:5	90:5	amount 12:3 55:11	appropriated 4:25
accrues 7:7	34:20 35:2,25 36:1	affirmatively 87:20	95:23	9:9 30:16
accuracy 26:19	58:5 88:19 99:8	affirmed 28:1	amounts 5:15 93:11	appropriately 11:25
acquaint 49:21	103:6,8	afternoon 3:8,9,10	amplify 4:17 24:23	appropriates 89:6
acquire 6:17,19	actions 44:5	3:16,20,21 4:7,20	53:19 86:6	appropriating 6:2
19:10,18 20:19	activity 48:4	agencies 6:6 35:3	analogy 40:7,14,17	11:6
23:2,6 24:7,20	actors 72:4	agency 6:8 10:11,23	73:23	appropriation 6:1
41:13 52:1 81:11	acts 53:22,22 70:23	16:25 58:10	analysis 50:20 72:7	6:10 7:2 14:24
85:13	95:23 97:8	ago 41:10	73:4,4 93:5 96:19	88:7 89:4 90:4,13
acquired 15:20	actual 20:10 29:5	agree 18:16 91:17	analytically 22:21	92:25
19:22 33:12 67:9	35:9 38:18 51:6	101:15	analyze 50:18	April 32:16
acquiring 6:2,13,14	add 4:17 36:17	agreed 43:6	analyzed 83:12	arbitration 19:11
6:14	52:22 68:1,25	ah 41:7	and/or 58:11 61:13	41:19 42:24 43:6
acquisition 19:3	70:12 100:21	ahead 27:20	61:15,20	43:10
22:10 39:20 40:25	102:6	Alamos 72:21,22	announce 52:13	archived 38:7,23
44:3	additional 7:14 19:9	allegation 8:14 9:11	announced 23:10	Archives 4:10 6:7
	82:24 99:23,24	9:12 29:3,20 30:17	answer 47:8	7:25 8:20 9:6

14:23 18:2 29:1 32:18 33:5,17 38:8 41:23 42:7 43:16 47:20 54:16 66:6 67:11,20,22 87:4 87:19,25 88:3,13 89:3,10,12,15 91:3 99:5 archiving 39:1 aren't 40:4 48:14,17 75:25 83:19 arguable 76:3 arguably 78:6,16 82:8,13 argue 7:12 19:2 72:12 argued 72:13 arguing 13:4 14:12 17:9,16 48:13,14 48:17,20 50:9,14 53:10 91:22 95:25 argument 1:18 3:11 3:20 5:23 7:3 15:6 16:15 25:7,9 49:24 50:9 82:22 92:9 98:8 101:3,4,5,9 101:24 104:4,21 arguments 68:2 Ark 73:20,23 arose 12:14 ARRB 17:3,12,14 22:19 23:18 41:12 42:25 43:2,6 48:8 76:23 87:17 ARRB- 75:4 articulated 7:19 27:5 asked 37:19 55:2,3 70:25 102:15 asking 15:22 22:9 40:23 54:24 63:20 98:23 aspect 62:13,14 72:15 73:9 assassination 4:21 6:5,22 10:3,8,9 15:15 16:2 33:1,14 34:21 38:3,6,18	39:10 41:21 45:21 51:7 75:10,16 78:7 78:8 83:11 86:20 87:6 89:9,11,13 91:1,2,19 assassinations 75:18 assert 85:24 asserted 83:15 asserting 84:11 assertion 56:11 asserts 39:15 84:15 assessment 15:19 assume 8:15,23 10:16,21 12:15 24:6,12 26:6,8 28:3 88:9 assumed 13:6 80:2 assuming 8:18 9:21 28:12,13 37:10,22 77:24 attaching 13:18 attained 90:25 attempted 60:23 attention 30:5 103:20 Attorney's 76:6 August 41:21,24 43:13 auspices 66:21 authority 15:20 19:8 31:6 39:22 40:19 41:1,13 43:1 43:3 45:19 51:22 52:18 66:23 69:1 71:5 79:16,18 82:17 83:18 90:1,3 94:20 102:19 authorization 39:20 authorize 7:2 14:24 authorizing 51:25 availability 39:1 available 36:16 38:7 38:24 45:5 47:13 62:7 90:25 aware 15:14,14 16:1 52:12 75:3,4 83:16 awareness 60:21 72:7	B back 18:1,8 23:17 51:13 54:16,18,21 54:24 56:22 59:20 61:6 62:5 63:16 65:8 81:23,23 82:5 87:9 88:17 94:17 94:19 96:25 98:12 99:16 backing 100:16 backs 71:5 bad 98:5 based 7:4 12:23 13:7 29:3 47:12 48:18 57:25 60:13 62:7 67:7 92:24 100:8 basic 73:8 basically 45:23 61:3 64:9 basis 56:9 bear 34:3,9 bears 84:16 beat 73:24 becoming 96:6 beginning 97:2,17 behalf 2:2,12 3:18 belabor 86:21 belief 28:24 29:7,8,8 35:10 49:13 believe 16:17 19:17 30:20 35:7 42:17 46:5 61:16 62:5 71:19 76:17 85:3 believed 7:23 33:4 97:18 belong 82:11 belongs 82:7 Ben 2:17 best 40:14 57:25 62:7 bets 99:7 better 94:25 beyond 21:23 22:1,3 42:10 51:24 69:25 big 64:23 bit 11:10 19:6 26:16 31:1 93:14 94:2 104:6	Blakey 56:7 58:1 60:15 67:5 74:15 board 15:15 19:8,10 19:17 20:5 24:7 41:22 42:14 Board's 15:22 16:20 bolstered 33:6 Borislav 2:13 4:8 born 82:13 borne 71:11 73:8 bottom 56:10 58:10 box 2:16 63:24 88:14 breadcrumbs 73:7 break 47:6 brief 19:3 42:25 54:10 86:18 briefing 11:8 18:2,8 18:9 43:23 49:4,11 85:3 94:18 95:1 briefly 86:19 briefs 4:15 103:17 103:24 104:22 bring 24:22 36:3,5 76:12,15 79:14 99:12,16 broad 51:9 83:6 broader 16:10 46:18 broadly 52:10 78:7 brought 19:2 27:7 34:7 35:10 99:10 99:12,14,14 101:13 bugs 56:16 Building 1:13 bulk 3:19 bunch 102:8 bundle 50:22 91:10 93:1,9,11,20 94:20 bundled 91:7 C C 3:1 California 70:5 call 29:6,7 30:4 73:4 called 3:3 camera 43:14,18 can't 20:22 21:1	38:19 48:2 55:23 55:24 60:7 care 32:2 carries 80:14 case 1:4 4:20 5:2,5,8 5:15 7:23 10:11,19 10:25 11:23 14:4,6 14:7,10,12,16 15:1 15:8 17:11,15 19:4 21:20 24:16 25:14 27:4 30:17 35:10 35:11 36:8,20 40:8 40:23 41:1,8 44:10 50:24 55:10 57:2,3 57:4 58:15 60:11 69:8,12 71:11,13 76:3 77:22 78:22 83:7 84:16 86:25 92:9,24 93:15 94:9 94:11 95:2,10,19 96:6,7,25 102:3,19 102:24 cases 39:24,25 57:5 93:18,21,22 categorical 54:7 57:7 71:1 cause 35:25 36:1 caveat 25:18 caveats 37:15 66:9 80:10 Cedar 92:19,20 93:4 93:6 94:2 CER 1:25 CERT 105:11 certain 39:19 71:2 84:6,6 certainly 15:10 16:18 17:23 23:13 28:16 31:23 53:9 102:3 104:16 CERTIFICATE 105:1 certify 105:4 CFR 16:16 chain 45:2 55:9,18 56:3 59:13,17 60:24 62:10,12,17 62:21 63:5,7,17
--	---	---	---	---

64:20 65:17 challenge 83:15 challenging 5:9 26:19 73:12 chance 36:18 86:7 102:11 characterization 75:9,14,15 characterized 57:2 check 52:23 Chevron 17:4,8 choice 87:12 88:16 88:22 chunk 64:10 Circuit 5:12 7:5,19 11:24,24 12:24 14:4 25:14 27:5,11 28:1 41:8 53:18 76:3,6 86:25 93:18 95:2,21 99:25 103:5 104:5 circumstances 18:5 69:18 citation 102:16 citations 102:22 cite 14:7 41:1 45:3 63:6 103:2 cites 59:20 85:2 citizens 43:4 Civil 2:15 claim 5:4 7:4,12,13 7:19 8:5,6,7,15 12:23,24 13:19 24:14 25:22 27:6,7 27:8,10 29:9 34:7 36:3,5 39:12 79:14 79:20 84:22,23 85:11,21,24 94:21 95:14 96:8,8,17 98:20,22 99:9,10 99:12,16 100:1,10 101:6,19 claimed 27:9 claims 1:1 3:5 7:10 8:9 27:23 79:1 80:10 clarify 11:5 48:12 101:11	clarity 41:5 classic 50:22 clear 5:16 17:7,10 30:23 37:15 60:4 62:10 70:14 78:23 104:14 clear-cut 11:22 clearly 37:21 83:14 CLERK 3:4 client 17:16,19 54:15,17,18,20 55:1 56:17,18,21 72:8 client's 17:17 54:15 58:18 close 16:5 closer 13:18 closest 69:8 cognizable 5:10 colleague 36:18 37:2 41:7 95:15 98:24 colleague's 3:25 collection 38:19,22 41:23 51:7 64:23 87:18 89:8,11 collections 43:16 colloquially 14:14 Columbia 37:19 combination 45:14 95:23 combined 95:18 come 23:17 77:8,12 78:23 82:13 87:2 94:9,11,17,19 95:22 99:16 comes 6:5 18:24 25:9 48:19,21 75:20 82:6 89:24 93:5,7,17 coming 11:11 74:10 74:24 89:21 Commission 9:6,7 33:13 Committee 12:20,22 47:15 Committee's 12:20 common 39:12 company 72:25 81:9	compare 6:11 compared 13:25 compensate 48:9 compensated 52:17 compensation 6:18 20:2,23,24 22:12 23:5 43:5 87:8 88:7,20 complaint 5:18 7:21 7:22 8:2,2,4 9:11 9:21 13:8 26:11,20 28:4,6,7,23 29:13 29:18 30:1,3,5 32:13,20 33:7 34:16,17 35:13,16 35:18,20,24 37:10 37:18,24,25 39:14 41:14,17,18 46:4,6 50:18 56:9,16 57:1 57:6,15 58:17,17 58:19,21,22,24 60:7,9,17 61:3,14 61:17,22,24 62:2,6 63:6,7,14,15 64:4 64:10 66:9,13 67:3 67:4 69:22,23 70:10 71:20,23 72:2,2,16 73:19 74:3,6,18 79:5 81:9 87:16 98:25 99:8 100:9,10 101:24 complaints 99:6 complete 50:17 103:1 completely 93:24 complex 93:14 complicated 80:25 complicates 16:15 conceal 26:7 concealed 26:2,9 53:11,22,22 97:8 concealing 25:12 concealment 54:6 59:23 62:13,14 65:22 67:25 68:21 70:22 71:3 96:24 97:1,13,13,14,22	98:4,19 conceals 25:19,21 conceptualize 94:14 concerned 52:7 concerning 33:14 concerns 4:21 concluded 12:22 40:24 41:12 42:25 43:3 48:8 conclusion 19:22 45:6 confer 71:20,24 confirm 75:15 85:15 confirmed 61:1 Confirming 57:18 conflict 29:13 Congress 5:22 6:12 6:21 18:20 38:22 42:3 49:3 connection 33:13 40:21 45:3 Connick 14:4,16 15:3,7,14 16:16 41:8 45:22 75:4 76:3 consequence 43:5 77:24 consequences 52:9 consider 80:22 consideration 81:12 103:5 considerations 66:15 considering 81:6 consist 89:8 consistent 81:18 constituted 21:19 44:10 constitutional 90:3 construction 16:23 37:6 48:7 59:23 contact 71:17,20 72:8 contacted 30:8 63:21 81:10 101:25 contain 62:21 context 40:24 45:16	77:21 94:21 102:20 contexts 40:20 Conti 93:21 continued 35:6 39:9 continues 7:24 29:1 29:4 35:7 60:22 88:11 continuing 38:15 42:1,23 continuously 26:11 26:12 contradict 29:14 contradictory 32:9 contrary 38:6 control 14:14,15 58:3,12 61:13,15 61:20 70:3 75:19 conversation 32:22 66:17 conversations 14:22 73:15 conveying 40:19 conveys 41:1 84:23 copies 89:8 copy 33:20 34:2,9 74:19 97:21 98:1 copyright 42:1 corporate 87:24 Corporation 72:24 correct 8:16,17 37:11 47:8 48:24 49:20 60:1,6 105:4 correctly 93:23 correspondence 55:3 couldn't 36:5 53:12 54:22 70:16 counsel 3:14 30:8 41:9 63:21 101:2 count 97:22 counterfactually 83:9 country 81:1 couple 4:16 16:10 83:20 102:22 coupled 44:3,15 course 12:11 37:4
---	--	--	---	--

39:17,21 41:12 43:4 54:5 56:25 60:11 74:20 81:13 86:2,12 court 1:1 3:4,7,11 3:24 4:3,6,11,22 6:10 8:3,11,18,24 9:2,10,14,19 10:1 10:13,16,25 11:8 11:20 12:14,17 13:3,24 14:2,6,20 15:2,5,11,13,22 16:1,7,9,14,21,24 17:2,5,11,12,21,23 17:25 18:4,11,14 18:23 19:1,15 20:1 20:4,8,12,20 21:1 21:9,14,18,25 22:7 22:16,19,24 23:8 23:14 24:21,25 25:4,8 26:1,5,8,16 26:23 27:5,17,20 27:23,24 28:10,17 28:19,21 29:11 30:6,21 31:11,15 31:19,25 32:5,10 32:12,15,19 33:2 33:18 34:1,8,15,18 35:2,12,19 36:6,9 36:14,17,22 37:1,4 37:19 38:9 39:9,22 39:25 40:9,24 41:2 41:4 42:5,13,20 43:17,20,22 44:7 44:16,19 45:22 46:1,8,22 47:11,19 47:25 48:12,17,23 48:25 49:8,12,23 50:5 51:13,21 52:4 52:20 53:1,7,10,15 54:2,11 55:14 56:1 56:5,14,25 57:10 57:12,16,20 58:2,9 58:16,24 59:2,4,7 59:17,21 60:2 61:2 61:11,19 62:3,5,23 63:5,10,19,23 64:2 64:9,18 65:4,19	66:3 67:6 68:6,10 68:18 69:1,6,15 70:11,17,21 71:4,9 71:15,22 72:1,13 72:17,21 73:1,20 73:24 74:1,10,16 74:22,25 75:3,12 75:16 76:20 77:5,5 77:6,14 78:2,5 79:1,15,24 80:11 80:19,21 82:1,19 82:21 83:2,19 85:2 85:6,10,16,20 86:2 86:4,12,16,23,25 87:1,11 88:21,25 89:7,18,21 90:6,11 90:14,23 91:6,13 91:15,21 92:2,14 92:16,20 93:13,15 93:24 94:1,6,13 95:2,5,7,9,12,24 96:10,14,20 97:20 97:25 98:2,7,24 99:11,23 100:2,7 100:11,21 101:1,8 102:5,8,17,21,25 103:3,9,11,25 104:7,10,12,17,20 court-approved 105:3 Court's 11:19 31:24 40:22 41:15 95:11 Courtroom 1:12 Courts 1:13 Covenant 73:21 cover 104:15 create 40:12 created 75:19 90:24 creates 77:15 88:22 94:20 100:5 credited 65:12 critical 55:10 62:21 65:20 currently 37:11 custody 45:2 55:9 55:18 56:4 59:14 59:18 60:25 62:11 62:12,17,21 63:5,7	63:17 64:21 65:18 cut 91:6 D D 3:1 D.C 1:15 8:2 33:17 34:17 67:21 Dallas 34:21 date 24:17 25:8,10 25:11 26:14 27:12 31:3,4,4 32:2,4,6 32:23 33:22,24 48:3 53:25 71:19 97:2 105:10 dated 33:7 dating 82:12 day 28:18 41:24 days 103:16,18 104:3,7 DC 2:5,7,18 DDC 35:2,18,20,24 decade 88:4 decades 55:1 81:13 decide 88:4,17 decided 19:20 20:5 45:18 decides 23:18 82:17 decision 19:18 20:13 20:17 23:2,6,9,10 24:2,7,8,9,13,17 24:19 41:18 42:23 43:10 53:18 90:8 92:16 defeats 29:9 defendant 1:8 2:12 53:21 58:3 97:7 defended 17:16 defer 17:3,6,11 define 16:2 defined 10:8,9 75:16 91:19 defines 16:8 definition 16:4,5 45:21 78:7 definitively 103:13 delay 35:5 69:3 98:16 delayed 96:10	delays 79:20 deliberately 83:5 delving 86:23 demand 11:17 66:20 demanding 26:12 demanding 8:1,3 demonstrable 70:15 demonstrated 29:9 denial 62:15,16 69:2 70:18 denials 60:15 denied 45:9 54:13 56:2 denies 69:10 denying 54:12 Department 2:15 4:9 43:7,9 52:3 depend 9:3 depending 13:9 83:1 83:3 depends 33:24 46:13 deposited 87:25 deprived 50:19 described 12:25 61:13 74:6 99:25 describes 43:11,12 43:12 descriptive 42:9 deserve 103:20 destroyed 59:16,18 80:3 detail 42:22 details 60:3 determine 19:20 72:24 detriment 61:1 developed 14:10 18:7 84:2,17 development 84:18 didn't 18:17 21:13 29:19 30:23 34:12 50:4 54:19 57:24 60:7 64:12 72:8 76:14 78:19,19 80:3,8 81:23 99:17 101:22,24 Diego 73:6	difference 21:20 23:20 40:1 51:1,18 55:5 57:12 68:15 79:25 different 19:4 22:14 24:16 29:21 40:1 40:20 57:5,8 58:15 69:21 72:25,25 81:2 93:6,23,24 95:22 differently 94:7 digital 1:25 72:20 73:3,4 diligence 28:12 44:25 54:25 55:16 62:25 67:17 70:1 71:16 72:3,9 81:13 101:13 direct 30:4 35:3 42:15 69:4 70:25 directed 41:22 42:6 42:13,14 87:17 directions 29:22 directly 11:19 32:9 37:8 38:24 53:8 60:19 63:4 93:4 disagree 22:23,25 disagreed 10:5,6 disagreement 30:1 disappearance 59:22 disbanded 79:7 disbelieve 66:1 68:22 disbelieving 65:24 discern 35:9 disclose 36:11 disclosed 64:11 discover 88:13 discretion 87:13 89:12 discussed 42:24 45:10 discussion 51:2 63:16 74:8 83:16 90:20 96:24 99:20 dismiss 3:12 5:19 18:16 27:22 28:2,3
--	---	---	--	--

37:18,23 51:5 53:2 56:10,12 95:9,10 dismissal 28:2 dismissed 27:22 99:13 dispose 84:7 disposition 79:18 dispute 26:24 51:24 disputed 5:11 disrespect 65:12 dissuaded 34:12 distinct 95:9 distinction 11:9,21 23:24 39:5 45:18 50:6,8,16 51:1 71:12 91:3 94:12 94:23 distinctions 68:24 distinguish 23:16 67:12 84:9 distinguishing 69:17 83:20 93:16 District 8:2 34:18 37:19,19 76:5 100:11 Division 2:15 Docket 37:25 document 24:2 66:14 67:3 85:3 documentary 83:10 documented 65:25 documents 14:15 55:9 63:17 80:25 doesn't 6:1,3,4 9:20 10:3 11:6,16 27:12 29:7 31:9,10 34:2 36:7 39:2 40:13 42:23 46:16 51:17 54:8 66:8,22 68:2 78:11,25 81:3 82:10 84:7,7,22 89:5 90:1,12 92:14 95:7 97:10 98:17 99:3,18 100:14 101:5 doing 3:19 31:20 73:3 don't 8:24 9:10 10:5	16:20 17:5 18:18 19:5,12 21:14,16 22:8,23,25 23:6,8 23:9,12,14 24:9 26:18 29:25 30:21 30:25 31:19,20 33:20 35:23 40:16 41:1 42:11,17 47:17 49:1,7 50:16 51:19 52:4,10,10 52:11 55:7,9 56:11 60:16,16 61:16 63:19 64:25,25 65:2,12,16,17 66:16 67:23 68:14 69:18 70:24 71:1 71:11,19,22 72:1 73:3,13,16 78:3,4 78:5 79:10,10,16 81:3,4 82:9,13 84:15 85:10 86:4 86:20 89:21 90:14 91:21,24 92:2 94:9 94:16 95:24 97:21 98:6,12,15 100:22 101:4 door 70:5 doors 55:25 draft 60:7 draw 26:25 28:8 50:6 68:10 94:22 drawing 50:8 91:3 dry 61:5 dunned 54:16 duration 39:2	46:2,13 49:15,16 51:25 82:2 84:10 84:18 89:20 effected 42:12 48:15 effective 44:21 effectively 38:4,17 51:6 effects 51:12 effectuate 90:4 eight 81:10 either 53:21 61:5 71:23 97:7 100:13 101:20 electronic 105:5 Elizabeth 105:3,11 embraced 54:7 56:10 emergency 63:23 emphasize 13:13 employee 63:2 enacted 42:3 78:14 enactment 43:24 44:2,4,6,8,15 95:17,18 96:5 endorse 48:10 endorsed 43:7 52:2 endorses 76:4 enforced 52:2 engaging 55:1 enormous 55:11 Enterprises 1:4 3:12 entire 93:9 97:5 entirely 5:16 37:15 98:3 entities 14:9 73:3 91:1 entitled 65:21,23 entitlement 98:14 entity 87:24 99:1 enumerate 104:13 episode 67:24 era 13:17 erased 45:18 erroneously 72:19 escaping 92:17 especially 19:3 ESQ 2:3,4,13,14 essentially 25:12	52:4 establish 69:24 established 12:8 19:13 45:1 51:21 estopped 15:5,6 evaluation 77:11 evaporated 12:21 event 44:9,18 events 44:12 45:14 54:4 67:17 68:4 Everybody 104:10 everyone's 78:13 evidence 31:15 32:8 44:14 45:5 46:3 56:3 62:22 63:13 64:21 65:7,14 66:11,12 67:25 70:15 97:16 ex-wife 27:9,14 99:21 exact 25:24 52:2 exactly 14:1,1 19:12 20:16 21:25 23:9 26:4 35:19 40:6,19 75:12 76:11 80:11 100:6,8 example 40:11 51:20 54:18 66:22 67:25 81:25 exchange 66:4 exclude 92:23 exclusion 92:17 excuse 38:23 41:19 54:2 exercise 18:15,19 49:2 55:21 73:12 82:17 83:17 exhibit 8:1,4 28:22 28:22 32:13 33:6 34:14 37:25 41:17 41:20 43:8,12 46:7 46:21 47:8,13 57:16 66:5 67:15 67:20 87:15,16 exhibits 7:22 28:7 100:9 exist 79:3 existed 7:19	existence 13:2 53:23 70:24 73:11 97:9 97:15 98:19 existing 35:21 exists 8:19 expired 7:11 explain 15:2 31:1 41:20 46:24 51:18 explanation 51:18 61:8,8 explicit 51:16 explicitly 13:25 70:9 exposed 63:1,1 express 39:21 expression 20:18 expressly 6:13 51:23 81:3 extend 78:6 extending 75:10 extensively 54:1 extent 30:20 50:6
F				
F 4:22 6:23 33:1 34:20 F.2d 53:18 102:24 102:25 F.3d 14:7 97:2 face 17:10 62:2 67:2 70:16 fact 6:24 22:19 25:6 25:13 26:3 27:3 29:15 30:9 38:21 49:9 51:12 54:2 56:16 62:15,21 64:6,20 69:2,10 79:23 84:5 factor 70:14 facts 28:3 29:12 32:5 54:1,21 56:15 68:21 73:8 factual 8:15 26:19 26:24 29:20 65:13 96:1 99:7 102:1 fails 54:3 fair 24:4,4 faith 98:5 falls 45:20				

familiar 4:14 14:3 14:17 15:17,18,24 84:25 family 47:22 far 5:17 32:5 61:4 69:17,25 Farrell 105:3,10,11 faulted 65:24 favor 29:22 February 1:16 federal 1:1 3:4 5:12 7:5,19 11:24,24 12:24 14:9 20:14 23:19 25:14 27:4 27:11,23 28:1 40:12 42:16,18 53:18 93:18 95:21 99:25 103:5 104:5 fight 8:24 fighting 10:13 figure 69:9 93:10 101:14 file 5:3 63:24 filed 4:22 8:2,7 34:17 56:17 files 64:20,23,24 filing 35:13 56:22 film 3:23 7:15,24 8:1,4,15,19,23 9:4 9:5,8,24 10:22 11:12 12:6,6,19,21 15:19,20 19:2,4,7 19:10,18,21,22,25 19:25 20:1,11,14 20:19 22:6 23:1,3 23:4,6 24:6,8,20 26:8,12,13 29:2,5 29:7 30:10,13,14 30:16 31:6,8 32:2 32:4,24 33:6,12,15 34:20 35:4,8 36:1 37:11,13,22,22 39:10 40:21 41:14 41:19,22,25 42:1,2 42:22 43:14 44:3,4 44:15,20 45:2,8 46:1,9,13 47:1,4 47:10,15 48:3,9	49:14 50:25 51:24 52:17 53:11 54:8 54:12,24 55:7,10 55:17,19 56:4,11 57:8,22 59:14,18 59:23 60:16,24,25 62:9,12,15 63:4 64:7 65:8,17 66:8 67:8,9,10,19,20,22 68:13 70:6 71:18 72:20 74:19 76:11 76:19,21 77:21 83:12,15 87:14,18 87:21,24,25 88:3,5 88:6,11,12,15,19 92:5,13 95:16 97:19 98:23 99:9 100:14,15,17 filmed 34:21 films 70:5 73:5 final 12:23 27:18 72:19 101:12 find 16:16 25:23 62:23 64:12 96:16 fine 96:7 104:7 firm 20:5 first 4:12 5:12,13,24 8:12 25:18 28:21 32:21 33:10 34:18 34:19,19,24 35:1 38:2 43:3,10 48:20 56:17 63:3 71:17 71:20 94:23 95:11 Fish 2:5 3:17,19 4:4 fishing 93:21 flies 67:2 floating 102:9 focus 4:16 68:4,8 101:5 focused 68:7 focuses 101:3 FOIA 55:4,6 64:11 65:16 follow 16:24 30:21 50:4 69:17 73:7 following 16:17 59:10 footage 32:24 66:8	footnote 85:3,5,6 foreclose 28:11 foregoing 105:4 forensic 73:4 forever 39:1 50:14 forfeited 49:24 fork 76:7 form 24:9 70:8 formal 21:6,14,16 21:19 24:1,7 55:3 66:14 formalize 20:13,17 formalized 23:11 formed 56:8 formulation 25:25 formulations 25:15 forth 29:17 Forty-five 104:7 forum 5:4 36:6 99:13,14 forward 92:10,24 102:4 104:22 found 10:17 16:3 33:19 63:14 75:18 82:8 88:24 99:5 four 53:7 framed 53:6 Franklin 2:17 Frankly 41:5 friend 87:15 95:12 full 39:15 fundamental 68:24 68:24 fundamentally 58:15 further 35:5 41:3 42:11 48:4,5 86:14	genuine 51:24 getting 6:17 30:24 89:1 give 4:17 20:24 25:24 36:18 61:6 86:7 98:11 103:15 given 21:2 31:12 41:5 44:19,22,24 44:25 45:4 49:12 49:13,13 51:9 gives 87:11 89:12 glimpse 80:24 Glitzenstein 2:4 3:19 4:1,1,3,4 36:23,24 37:5 38:10,13,15 39:23 40:6,16 41:5 42:10 42:17,21 43:19 44:2,11,17,24 45:24 46:3,15 47:6 47:12,23 48:1,16 48:20,24 49:6,9,20 50:3,15 51:19 52:7 52:23 53:5,13,16 54:23 55:16 56:2,6 56:24 57:1,11,13 57:18,21 58:8,13 58:20 59:3,5,9,19 60:1,6 61:7,16 62:1,4,24 63:9,11 63:22 64:1,3,16,19 65:5,20 66:13 67:14 68:9,17,20 69:4,13,20 70:12 70:19,22 71:7,14 71:19,24 72:11,15 72:18,22 73:2,22 73:25 74:7,13,17 74:23 75:2,6,13 76:17 77:1,13,18 78:4,17 79:21 80:6 80:16,20,22 82:15 82:20 83:1,3 85:1 85:5,8,14,18,25 86:3,10,14 102:12 102:14,18,23 103:1,4,10,22 104:1,11,19	go 14:13,15 18:1 22:1 27:20 36:14 45:19 55:19,19,23 55:24 62:5 64:23 64:24 72:9 73:9,13 81:20 83:14 84:5 88:15 91:2 92:24 95:7 96:25 102:4 goes 21:23,24 22:2 42:8 69:25 going 23:4,21 27:25 42:6 51:13 55:23 57:13 58:6,19 64:22 68:7 71:15 72:3 73:22 82:10 92:9 97:4 good 3:10,16,24 4:7 4:11,20 21:4 22:11 24:24 95:6 104:17 goodness 88:25 government 4:6,23 4:24 5:9 6:16,18 7:24 8:14,22 9:4,5 9:9,16,24 10:2,11 10:22 11:1,7,13,15 11:25 12:7,7,18 13:4,6,6,9 14:10 14:12 16:25 19:22 19:23 20:7,10 21:11 22:5 23:2,4 23:5 24:20 25:12 25:19,21 26:2,7,13 28:25 29:4,7 31:5 31:7 33:4,12 35:3 35:7,11 37:9,12,16 38:15,17 39:7,9,14 40:17,20 41:6,10 41:25 42:2 44:19 44:23 45:17 46:11 46:17,18 47:5 48:10 49:17,18,23 49:25 50:1,5,10,13 50:24 51:4,15,22 52:1,13 53:6,11,12 54:3,8 55:5 56:9 57:2 65:11,23,25 66:2,4 67:9 68:2 69:10 70:18 72:12
---	--	--	---	--

G

G 3:1
gap 31:22
gather 89:14
Gayle 2:23 3:21 5:2
32:17 34:6,17,25
67:16
gears 95:4
general 39:23 63:11
63:14

75:25 76:4,18,21 76:23 77:23 78:11 78:18,22,24,25 79:11,25 80:2,3 82:7,10,11,17 83:4 83:9,13 84:5,11,14 85:2 87:6,12,20 88:5,10,18 89:6,9 89:25 90:19 92:21 92:25 93:8 95:14 97:19,20,23 98:5 98:11,12,15,23 99:1 100:17 102:20 Government's 3:12 10:17,20 11:12 38:2 39:18 45:24 46:13 47:2,4 49:14 53:2 54:9 56:12 67:2 69:2 70:15 76:1,24 78:9 81:8 83:17 98:14 governmental 5:14 5:18 13:15 granddaughter 3:22 grandfather 32:25 32:25 Great 104:17 greater 12:12 grounds 95:10 guess 63:1 101:18	handwritten 70:2 happen 5:13 happened 30:24 31:13,22 42:5,16 42:22 47:18,18 52:6 59:22 68:4 81:18 87:10,14 101:15 happy 24:10 41:2 104:10 hard 20:20 23:15 54:21 56:18,20 62:24 94:14 hard-pressed 94:22 harder 23:23 hasn't 21:22 77:10 haven't 15:25 18:7,7 75:14 77:19 80:11 84:2,16 103:13 haystack 55:13,20 55:22,23 He'll 3:19 headlong 12:11 hear 4:12 heard 54:9 hearing 18:12 103:20 104:23 hedged 99:6 heirs 9:25 19:19 20:3,18 22:4 88:17 held 14:16 40:12 47:4 78:20 helpful 18:12 102:10 103:21 104:2,21 Henry 47:16,20 here's 14:2 82:3 103:11 hesitance 31:24 hey 78:11 hindsight 73:16,17 historical 34:20 81:14 history 51:20 Hmm 38:10 hold 14:8 50:13 holds 12:3 62:15 Honestly 98:5	Honor 3:16 4:2,5,7 4:19,20 5:5 8:22 13:12 14:21 16:19 17:8 18:21 23:13 25:6,23 27:2 29:25 30:4 31:18 32:8 34:6,13 35:23 36:21,24 37:1 40:6 40:16 41:8,15 42:11,19 43:19 44:24 46:20 47:7 47:24 48:6,16,22 49:7,22 50:3,15 51:20 52:24,25 53:14,17 55:11 57:5,14,18 58:8,13 58:20 59:3,12 60:1 60:6 62:2,14 63:9 63:12,22 64:17 65:6 67:1,14 69:13 69:21 70:12,19 71:7,14 74:7,14,24 75:6,15 80:7,16 82:15 85:1,9,15,18 86:1,11,15,17 92:11 93:3 95:3 96:25 99:20 100:25 101:12 102:15,23 103:5 103:23 104:1,3,11 104:16,19 Honor's 47:9 Honorable 1:21 3:5 hopefully 86:18 House 12:19,20,22 45:6 46:5 47:14 48:14 56:7 60:21 61:18 62:8 72:18 housed 33:16 67:10 67:20 Howard 1:13 HSC 64:7 74:5 HSCA 30:10 57:22 58:25 59:24 60:25 61:4,15,22,24 62:13 64:24,24 65:8 70:3,6 72:4 74:18 79:6,7,7	99:2 hunting 47:17 hypothetical 8:25 10:14 12:5 31:21 37:9,20 39:8,13 88:10 hypothetically 83:11 hypotheticals 94:16 <hr/> I <hr/> i.e 37:22 I'd 4:12 17:23 32:8 37:1,8 67:22 71:4 86:7 92:11 93:3 94:22 95:3,11 96:24 I'll 4:17 15:9 16:18 18:8 29:24 30:4 36:18 45:2 58:5 63:12,13,17 68:24 86:17,19 104:21 I'm 3:17 4:8,14 9:19 11:10,11 14:14,21 15:17,22,24,24 19:25 20:16 21:7 22:1,9 23:1 24:10 27:20 31:18 32:25 33:23 35:18 36:14 36:20 40:9 43:22 46:15,15 49:5 50:3 52:12 57:13,20 59:2,4,5 64:22 68:7 69:6,7,14 72:13,14 74:7,9,11 74:13 76:12 77:20 77:24 80:12,21 84:1 85:18 93:20 97:3,4 98:3 I've 32:15 42:18 88:24 102:8 idea 29:4 30:22,23 62:19,20 89:25 100:17 identical 5:4 57:3,4 identified 83:10 identify 3:14 6:16 70:9 83:7	ill 98:4 illustration 35:21 52:15 imagine 16:4 66:18 72:11 immediately 74:24 93:18 impacts 79:12 impatient 89:22 implemented 76:22 implementing 15:16 75:5,23,23 76:15 import 65:6 important 13:14 33:15 35:1 45:1 55:8 64:20 70:14 81:14 87:22 99:7 99:19 101:15 103:10 imprimatur 66:23 in-interest 9:18 inability 50:17 inclined 17:23 include 47:13 75:17 89:11 included 41:18 includes 38:22 61:17 including 63:24 inconsistent 15:7 incorrect 62:19 index 59:13 indication 90:17 individual 46:10 individuals 76:2 inferences 26:25 informal 21:21,24 22:1 66:19 information 7:14 25:13 30:12,24 36:4 47:13 55:11 56:7,8 57:25 58:14 60:14 62:7,8 63:2 63:6,8 64:14 69:12 74:14 81:15 83:6 99:11,15,17 informed 87:3 inherently 25:14
---	--	---	---	---

53:24 73:11 initially 4:23 injury 53:24 70:24 73:11 instance 93:21 intend 54:6 intent 20:18 interacts 85:11 interest 5:11 98:11 interference 28:8 interpret 35:16 interpretation 10:4 11:4 48:11 89:1,19 interpretations 35:13 interpreted 38:3 40:18,18 41:7 interprets 16:21 38:5 invalid 17:18 investigation 12:22 33:13 35:16 investigative 69:25 investigatory 18:20 35:20 49:3 invoked 19:8,16,16 involve 84:1 involved 22:22 24:1 35:4 72:4 involves 32:5 involving 94:10,11 irrelevant 31:1 49:4 isn't 39:21 66:11 77:14 91:16,16 92:3 issue 7:3 8:12,13 12:12,12 17:22 28:4,19 37:6,16 41:6 45:2,15 48:6 53:19 62:11 67:24 74:20 76:14 80:12 84:17 86:22,23 87:3 95:4 issued 75:5 issues 18:5 37:2,7 45:4 53:6,7 65:22 74:25 103:6,12 104:13	it's 4:1,13 5:16 8:19 9:12 10:15 13:14 14:7 15:6 16:9,10 20:20 21:3,7 23:15 25:20,21 26:16 28:20,20 29:6 33:20 38:13,25 39:16 40:20 44:2,4 44:5,8 45:13 46:9 48:18 49:4,21 50:25 51:13,16 52:1,2,2 54:13,25 55:12 56:15,16 57:8 59:6,19,20 60:4,10 61:23 63:19 65:5,6 66:14 66:20,20,21,22 69:4 70:6 72:1,2 73:20 74:10,10,24 78:12,20,23 79:5 82:10 84:17 86:21 91:17 92:7,8 93:14 93:23 94:4,14 100:18 102:3,23 103:4,10 item 21:12 93:7 items 6:2,4 11:6 75:25 76:1	31:16 36:10 38:3,6 39:11 40:18 42:8 43:15,24 44:21 46:2,12,25 47:2 48:9,19,21 49:15 49:16 50:12 51:14 51:17 75:5,22 76:22 79:9 82:23 86:20,24 87:5,11 88:21,24 90:10,20 91:15 95:8,17 96:17 John 4:22 6:23 33:1 33:14 34:20 joined 4:8 joining 3:20 Judge 3:9 judicially 15:6 jumping 4:18 June 33:7 jurisdiction 26:21 76:13 86:22 jurisdictional 25:2 28:4,20 29:12 95:10 Justice 2:15 4:9 43:7 43:9 52:3 justify 24:3	8:5 26:18 33:25 34:4,9,10 35:8,14 56:18 60:10,13 77:22 100:4 101:17 knew-or-should-h... 8:8 know 3:23 5:3 7:17 7:21 14:12,22 18:4 20:17 21:14,16,18 22:8 23:8,9,15 24:9 28:4 29:19 33:3 34:12 36:8 40:1 44:8 45:15,17 45:22 47:17,18 50:19 51:4,22 52:8 52:9 54:3,5,9,17 54:19 55:21,25 57:1 59:11 60:20 60:23 62:18 64:25 65:18 66:4,15 68:13 70:24 71:17 73:3,10,14 74:18 75:3 76:9 78:12,20 79:3,4,6,10,10,13 79:17 80:25 82:13 84:15,15,20,24 85:10,12 88:14 91:22 94:8 98:9,13 99:1 100:16,19 104:4 knowledge 28:14 29:5,6,6,21 35:9 35:17,22 56:20,22 57:8,9 58:19,23 66:11,12 known 7:18 8:9 28:8 33:25 34:4,10 35:9 53:12 54:22 59:24 60:21,24 62:10,12 66:25 79:6 101:17 101:18 knows 6:23,23 84:2 84:3 99:4 Kurt 2:4 3:18 4:1 Kushnir 2:13 3:9 4:7,8,19 8:17,21 9:1,3,12,15,23	10:6,15,21 11:3,18 11:21 12:16,18 13:12 14:1,5,19,21 15:4,9,12,17,24 16:4,8,13,18 17:5 17:20,22 18:1,10 18:13,21,25 19:7 19:17 20:2,7,9,16 20:25 21:7,10,16 21:23 22:3,15,18 22:23,25 23:12 24:4,24 25:3,5,17 26:4,6,22 27:2,18 27:21 28:1,16,18 29:24 30:7 31:2,14 31:18,23 32:1,7,11 32:13,16,21 33:3 33:23 34:5,11,16 35:18,23 36:13,15 36:20,22 38:9,11 38:14 86:7,16,17 87:2,13 88:23 89:2 89:16,20,24 90:9 90:12,16 91:5,12 91:14,20,24 92:11 92:19 93:3,14,17 93:25 94:4,7,24 95:6 96:4,12,15,22 97:23 98:1,3,17 99:6,24 100:6,8,24 101:2,10 102:7 104:2,9,16
	J Jackson 45:11 67:16 67:18 Jackson's 28:24 Jeffrey 2:24 4:10 Jenkins 11:23 12:9 12:25 jenna.e.munnelly... 2:20 JFK 5:21,24 6:9,19 6:25,25 7:4,8,10 10:1,7,12,18,19,23 10:24 11:4,5,11,13 11:15 12:8 13:1,10 13:19,21,22 14:3,8 14:11,13,23 15:16 15:20 16:6,22,24 17:9 19:8 24:18 28:24 30:15 31:5	K Karen 1:25 keep 10:2 58:6,16 58:19 87:7 89:14 keeping 10:7 keeps 12:1 Kennedy 4:22 6:23 33:1,14 34:21 kept 12:7 key 54:4 kind 14:14 16:15 21:4 23:25 24:2 25:15 31:21 40:10 69:8 71:15 72:14 74:2 84:6 85:23 94:2,10,19 98:8 102:9 103:12,12 kinds 94:13 knew 5:2 7:18,23	L L 2:3 laboratory 7:15 lack 58:18 lacked 62:16 lacking 88:8,9,11 lacks 40:25 land 93:5 94:4,5,12 Landou 2:24 4:10 language 5:25 6:10 6:23,25 38:22 39:17,19,21 42:10 89:4 90:13 98:25 law 6:11,20 7:8,9 9:8,19 10:23 13:25	

25:11 28:25 30:15 39:12 42:3 43:13 43:17 45:11 46:11 51:15 71:11,13 75:24 78:5,13,14 79:22 82:24 83:23 84:9,10,13,16,24 90:6 96:6,18 laws 83:21 lawsuit 29:15 54:5 lawyer 66:22 layout 28:23 lead 18:17 81:23 leads 45:6 51:14 learned 44:25 45:4 58:1 67:4 learning 67:4 leaves 51:24 led 21:22 54:4 81:22 left 50:24 51:9 104:13 legal 47:21 53:16 66:14 84:1,10 legislation 7:7,8 42:3 legislative 7:6 51:20 let's 8:11,11 11:25 12:6 24:6 29:7 40:10 52:20 68:6 68:10 letter 7:25 27:9,12 27:14 29:17 32:16 32:23 33:7,9,19 66:6,19,24 67:7,7 67:16,19 98:22 99:21,25 100:10 level 17:19 57:7,8 66:23 69:24 70:7 72:23 levels 65:6 Lewis 2:14 4:9 liability 12:9 library 55:24 light 96:1 limitations 5:6 7:10 8:13 24:22 25:2,9 37:7 45:4 46:23 52:21 53:1,4 75:1	76:10 77:9,9 92:9 line 12:9 34:19 56:10 74:1,12 list 104:12 litigation 5:17 little 11:10 19:6 25:20 31:1 42:21 53:3 68:7 93:6,23 94:2,7 104:6 LLC 1:4 3:12 LMH 87:23 locate 60:23 log 70:3 logical 71:10 logs 55:15 long 9:17 17:3,6 24:22 longer 12:3 67:8 look 5:5 15:9,11 16:19 17:24 28:5 28:22 30:3 34:3,13 41:3 47:23 48:5 52:5,14 58:2,9 60:3,8,17 64:23,24 69:18 73:17 75:7 78:5 81:20 85:25 86:25 87:15 89:5 93:8 101:16 104:21 looked 15:25 21:15 21:17,19 23:9 34:2 88:14 looking 28:11 31:7 41:9 46:20 47:8 55:20 59:5 64:22 64:25 65:3 68:13 74:7,9,13 76:5 80:24 97:3 looks 33:20 34:2 58:6 73:17 88:3 Loretto 94:9 Los 72:21,22 lost 59:2,15 73:23 79:3,24 80:4,13,14 lot 18:15 49:3 54:5 62:24,25 80:10 99:3 lots 71:9	lovely 69:15 luxury 73:13 <hr/> M <hr/> M 105:3,10,11 Madison 1:14 magic 52:5,8 90:14 90:16 magnified 59:22 maintained 27:15 59:15 70:4 100:19 major 5:22 7:3 making 15:6 50:9 65:1,13 manners 21:4 22:11 March 104:5 Markey 1:13 marks 102:9 Martin 102:24 Martinez 7:20 8:9 25:24 27:3,22 79:22 96:25 97:2 99:20 101:16 material 51:8 68:21 83:4 matter 16:22 28:20 38:5 46:16 48:7 70:2 99:7 105:6 mattered 76:9 matters 21:10 27:21 29:3 31:2 64:21 70:17 Matthew 2:14 4:9 mean 10:16,19,19 15:5 16:9,20 20:20 20:21 21:1 26:18 28:10 31:23 35:15 37:12 39:18,23 40:2,7 41:2 42:6,7 44:5 51:14,21 53:6 54:14 56:17 58:21 60:19 61:7,19,21 63:5 65:12 66:13 66:18 67:1,11 68:1 68:4,6,18 69:5 71:4,9 73:10 78:10 79:4,10,15,19 80:1 80:9,11,16,23	81:10,25 82:3,3,8 82:21,21,22 83:20 84:24 85:2,10 89:22 92:6,16,21 94:1,15,16 96:4 meaning 16:21,23 16:25 17:6 58:11 means 7:9 16:24 48:25 82:23 mediation 19:11 meet 3:24 4:11 member 27:7 mention 78:3 mentioned 41:9 75:7 86:25 95:2 99:21 merely 74:19 100:1 merits 53:6,9 middle 56:25 mind 43:23 63:20 74:10,24 75:20 93:17 minutes 4:16 misrepresentation 102:20 misrepresented 103:7 missed 46:19 missing 49:5 misspoke 47:7 Mm-hmm 33:2 56:1 65:4,19 73:1 74:16 modify 27:8 moment 24:6,12,13 24:15 26:7 41:10 44:21,22 71:25 79:23 85:14 86:5 88:10 92:18 100:23 moments 4:18 money 77:8 months 33:8 motion 3:12 4:13 5:19 18:15 25:1,1 25:6 26:9 27:22 28:2,3 37:17,23 38:2 49:7 51:5 53:2 56:10,12 68:2	101:24 move 77:17 moving 37:18 81:1 83:24 MSPB 102:24 Muchmore 70:5,6 multiple 40:20 81:2 Murphy 32:17 mystery 57:23 59:8 70:9 79:5 99:3 <hr/> N <hr/> N 3:1 N.W 1:14 name 3:17,25 92:17 NARA 2:24 14:8,12 17:15 29:15,17 30:10,13 31:12,15 33:9,18 34:1,8 36:10 37:11 38:17 39:10 44:4,14 45:6 49:10 51:6 54:7,8 54:12,17,17,20,20 54:24 55:6,24,24 56:2,11,19 57:24 58:3,7,10 59:15 60:5,16 61:5,12,14 61:20,24 62:15,19 63:4,7,21 64:7,13 64:15,24 65:7 66:12 68:14,23 72:5 79:8 80:17 81:4 NARA's 38:18 51:7 62:16 64:20 81:4 narrative 81:19 narrowly 53:20 97:6 National 1:13 4:10 6:7 7:25 9:6 14:22 18:1 29:1 32:18 33:5,16 38:8 41:23 42:7 66:6 67:11,20 67:22 87:4,19,25 88:2,12 89:2,10 native 34:21 necessarily 16:20 necessary 82:25 need 12:2,21 15:2
--	--	---	--	--

17:11 18:18 23:25 24:2 40:17 49:1 52:4 55:21,25 66:15 77:17 80:6 84:9 90:1,14,16,17 90:17 93:8 94:16 95:7,20 96:15 needed 5:3 52:8 84:5 99:12,15,17 needle 55:12,20,22 needs 90:3,5 negligent 80:8 never 42:18 60:19 new 14:17 64:4 76:4 76:5 84:23 100:5 news 81:10 95:6 newsworthy 81:14 nice 71:12 84:18 Nix 3:22 7:15,24 8:1 8:3,15,19,23 9:4 10:17,22 11:12 12:6,6,19,21 19:24 24:20 26:8,12,13 29:2,5 30:10,13,16 33:1,6,12 34:22 35:4,7 36:1,10 44:14,20 45:2,7 46:13 47:3 49:13 57:22 59:14,23 60:24,25 62:12 64:7 66:5 67:8,9 68:12 70:4 72:20 74:19 76:9 83:12 85:13 88:17 92:5 92:13 95:16 100:17 Nix- 28:23 45:10 Nix-Jackson 2:23 3:21 5:2 7:23 8:5 9:22 26:11 32:17 33:4,8 34:6,17,25 35:6 60:11 67:21 80:18 97:18 Nix-Jackson's 37:18 Nix's 9:24 Nixes 23:22 nominal 50:11,12 nondisclosure 49:10	notably 55:4 note 37:17 72:15 75:9 notes 52:24 70:3,4 86:10 102:10,18 notice 23:19 78:13 78:15,24 82:9,12 82:16 83:14 noticed 25:6 notify 78:11 noting 70:3 notion 65:22 73:6 November 34:22 nuanced 25:20 number 3:13 38:1 86:21,24 95:22 numbers 63:24,24 63:25 NW 2:6	17:25 18:10,23 20:8,12 21:9,18,25 22:24 23:17,21 24:4,25 25:4 26:1 26:23 27:17 28:17 30:7 31:19,25 32:10 34:15 36:9 36:17,20,22 41:4 42:20 43:20 44:7 44:16,19 47:11,25 48:17,23,25 49:8 52:20 55:22,25 56:13 57:16,20 58:16 59:4,9,21 61:2 62:3 63:20 64:2,9,18 65:8,9 66:10 68:6 69:9,15 70:11 72:17 74:11 74:22,25 75:16 76:6 78:4 79:15 83:2 85:10,16,20 86:4 89:18 91:6,13 91:21 93:13 94:6 94:24 95:5,5 96:3 98:7,11 100:7,21 101:1,10,10 102:5 102:8,17,21 103:3 103:9 104:7,9,12 104:20 on-point 52:16 ONF 1:4 3:12 7:11 7:22 9:17,17,20,20 9:22 11:2,22 12:11 13:16 24:17 25:13 28:14 29:18 31:3 71:16 85:13,23 101:19 ONF's 5:16 29:20 open 55:25 103:12 104:13 operation 42:8 43:17 44:11,12 46:11 75:24 82:24 83:23 84:9,13 operative 43:2 opportunity 17:24 86:9 opposed 35:17	49:25 option 87:5 Oral 1:18 order 3:3 19:24 22:5 37:2 87:21 90:4 93:10 103:14 104:15 organization 17:17 organizations 81:11 original 7:24 8:3 10:22 12:6,19,21 20:10 29:2,5 31:3 32:24 33:21 34:3 35:4 37:18 43:14 43:18 44:14 45:7 50:25 54:24 57:22 59:1,14 60:24,25 62:12 66:8 73:5 74:4,19 83:12,15 97:22 Orleans 14:17 76:5 76:5 Orville 3:22 32:25 34:21 outset 95:10 outside 5:5 11:7 outsider 73:12 80:23 overall 54:25 overcome 98:21 owned 14:9 91:18 owner 21:5 68:12 77:22 82:4,9 84:21 84:23 87:10 owners 98:13 ownership 6:4 11:9 11:22 20:13 37:12 39:4,5,15,20 40:2 40:13,14,25 41:13 44:23 45:20 46:25 47:4,21 49:17,19 49:22 50:1,7,8,22 51:8,16 75:25 79:12 80:2,4,8 83:15 84:10,11,12 90:7,18,21 91:25 owns 8:20 9:2,14,21 11:2 13:5	P P 3:1 p.m 3:3 104:23 page 30:5 33:11 34:18,24 38:1,11 38:13 41:20 43:8 43:12 60:8 87:16 pages 103:18 paid 20:2 panel 41:19 42:1,24 43:6,10 paragraph 30:5 33:10 34:19,24 43:11 57:14,20,21 57:21 58:2,9,10,25 59:4,10,10,12,20 60:22 61:8,9 62:11 74:3,9 97:5 paragraphs 63:14 parallels 68:10,14 pardon 54:3 Parish 76:5 parse 95:20 parsing 70:2,4 part 11:8 13:14 21:3 25:18 33:15 35:16 35:20 37:24 46:19 48:21 54:11,25 56:7 64:1 67:17 81:12 89:14 97:5 97:13,16 98:5,20 101:23 particular 4:16 38:1 44:9 62:25 67:24 74:11 79:16,22 82:6 91:9 particularly 84:3 100:13 parties 18:7,7,8,16 76:14 84:2,16 party 78:24 81:16 85:24 90:7 passage 7:7 13:10 14:11 25:23 97:3 99:19 passed 5:21 6:12 passing 90:6 path 55:22,25
--	---	--	---	---

<p>pattern 79:23 Pause 85:17 86:13 pay 22:17 23:5 88:19 paying 22:16 23:22 23:22 88:7 payment 21:22,24 22:2,13 people 72:6 percent 65:12 period 13:18 39:2 permanent 10:2,7 10:20 11:1,14 13:9 39:4,6 49:21 50:25 perpetuity 91:9 person 3:22 personal 93:7,16 94:10,15,22 personally 54:14 104:4 persons 75:19 perspective 49:6 50:22 51:3 65:21 81:7 82:4 103:23 phone 30:4 photo 70:3 phrased 66:19 physical 6:7 40:2,8 40:11,23 84:22 94:14 physically 42:5 83:24 piece 55:10 81:14 82:6 91:9,11,18 96:2 pieces 63:13 pinpoint 5:14 13:15 44:9 95:13 place 1:14 24:15 30:3 55:15,15 56:17,18,20 61:23 65:1,3 68:19 69:10 87:17 96:15,18 places 81:2,21 plain 16:21 17:6 plaintiff 1:5 2:2 3:15 3:18 4:14 5:2,10 5:13 10:4 13:14</p>	<p>25:22 26:2,10,17 27:15 28:9 30:9,12 33:25 34:4,9 38:4 38:19 50:24 51:7,9 53:21,23 58:4,12 60:11,23 61:1 63:21 70:8,23 81:19 95:13,22,25 97:7,8,12,15,17 98:10,18 99:11 100:4 101:18,20 103:6,7 Plaintiff's 18:24 30:2 39:12 61:10 80:18 81:6,7 97:17 98:10 100:19 101:20 103:22 plaintiffs 98:13 plan 16:23 pleaded 54:1 pleadings 4:15 26:17,25 27:1 28:11 29:23 please 3:7,14 32:12 37:1 67:22 plus 94:1 95:17 point 7:13 23:3 27:3 29:21 32:8 45:5,13 47:17 48:5 53:17 61:4,9,13 62:6 63:10 65:10 69:16 72:7 77:18 79:16 86:21 88:4,21 92:19,20 93:4,4,6 94:2 96:16,17 101:3,12,16 102:2 pointed 66:9 87:16 93:23 98:25 pointing 84:1 points 51:15 52:25 66:4 100:25 police 12:1 18:15,19 49:2 portions 63:15 posed 37:9,20 39:9 95:12 position 5:17 27:16 30:1,2 37:13 39:18</p>	<p>41:11 54:22 87:3 100:20 positioning 67:2 possess 7:24 8:22 29:1,4 35:7 49:25 50:17 76:18 83:6 88:11 possessed 31:7 32:2 32:4 83:4 97:19 possesses 100:17 possessing 95:16 possession 8:14,19 10:2,8,10,10,17,20 10:22 11:1,9,12,14 11:15,22 12:2,3,7 12:24 13:7,8,10 14:15 20:4,10 26:7 26:13 30:14 33:5 33:16 37:11,13 44:3,13,20,23 45:7 45:9,10,13,16 46:10,14,18 47:2,3 49:14,18,21 50:7,8 50:10,25 51:3 53:11 57:22 58:3 58:11,25 59:24 61:12,14,20 62:9 67:8,10 74:18 76:1 76:2,25 78:18,23 79:25 81:8,8 83:5 87:7 91:1,4,7,9,23 91:25 92:4,8,12 93:8 95:16 possessor 59:25 possessory 91:17 92:3 93:2 possible 9:7 35:12 50:20 97:10 104:6 Post 2:16 post-enactment 19:9,23 postponed 25:10,12 potentially 72:10,11 82:2 power 12:1 18:15,19 18:20 49:2,3 powerful 100:13 practice 51:22</p>	<p>prayers 34:24 precise 5:14,17 13:15 68:15 precisely 39:6 51:4 predecessor 5:1 7:22 54:19 80:18 97:18 100:19 101:21 predecessor-in-int... 54:19 predecessor's 58:18 predecessors 26:18 28:14 29:19 54:15 71:16 72:8 100:4 preempt 39:11 preexisting 44:13 45:13 46:17 95:16 preliminary 69:25 premise 76:17,20 preparing 25:7 present 2:22 60:23 presented 53:8 presenting 24:25 preservation 38:25 63:24 preserved 38:7,23 President 4:21 6:22 33:14 42:4 presiding 3:6 presumably 78:13 98:13 pretty 68:15 prevailed 15:7 preventing 38:17 51:6 previous 74:5 previously 30:11 47:17 64:8 65:8 74:4 price 19:13 principle 53:19 69:5 69:7 prior 59:20 83:6 95:17 private 16:11 45:20 46:9,10 52:1,13,17 75:10,17,18 81:9 81:15,24 82:1</p>	<p>privately 78:21 91:18 probably 16:5 problem 46:23 85:12,23 98:9,21 problems 5:22 procedurally 24:3 53:5 procedure 6:15 84:1 proceed 79:1 proceeding 19:11,13 19:20,21 77:4,7,11 77:14,15 proceedings 3:3 27:13 85:17 86:13 105:6 process 6:17 19:15 21:5,21,24 22:1,12 24:1 35:21 41:16 54:25 67:18 78:25 81:13 83:23,25 84:6,10 produce 35:4 promulgated 15:15 17:17 79:12 proper 36:5 85:23 property 5:10,11,15 13:23 21:4 22:13 22:22 23:18 43:4 43:15,18 45:20 46:9,11 50:23 52:1 52:13,17 58:4,12 61:13,21 76:24 77:22,23 78:15 79:11,12,17 82:4,7 82:8,23 83:21 84:21,23 85:21 89:6 90:7 91:8,10 91:11,11,18 93:1,5 93:7,10,16 94:10 94:15,21,22 98:13 prosecutor 14:17 prospect 63:1 protected 38:7,23 protection 39:1 provide 23:13 24:10 77:25 87:8 100:16 102:16</p>
---	---	---	--	---

Provided 96:20 provides 87:5 provisions 44:13 51:10 public 6:11,20 9:8 9:19 38:8,24 43:4 43:14,18 48:19 51:15 75:11,17 publication 42:15 42:18 publicly 36:16 published 12:23 20:14 publishing 23:19 purports 78:6 purpose 43:13 purposes 26:9,20 pursuant 12:1,19 15:20 21:12 42:2 44:5,8 45:19 77:2 pursue 102:3 pursued 55:17,18 pursuing 101:14 puts 82:8 puzzle 26:16 96:2 puzzled 74:2 puzzles 54:12	Raiders 73:23 raise 31:20 76:14 86:6 raised 56:21 103:19 raises 43:23 ratified 56:13 reach 20:18 reached 9:4,5 19:19 22:20 23:5 reaches 67:18 reaching 21:2 22:4,9 read 11:5 46:16 75:14 77:19 78:2 89:7 95:1 96:25 97:4 102:21 reading 86:10 reads 30:7 33:11 real 81:12 93:5,16 94:15,21 realized 68:20 really 18:18 19:5 28:19 29:6 39:19 54:4,21 58:5 65:5 67:1 70:13 86:23 95:7 reason 13:14 21:10 27:21 30:2 31:2 36:4 40:7 66:1 68:22 76:12 95:9 101:7 103:15 reasonable 11:3 reasoning 12:10 received 7:14 30:12 60:14 65:7 74:14 recited 74:8 reconcile 61:22 reconstructed 73:15 record 3:15 10:8,9,9 27:8 39:11 51:23 63:25 66:17 87:6,7 87:9 89:8 91:2,19 recording 4:21,24 4:25 105:5 records 5:21,24 6:5 6:6,7,9,13,15,16 6:18,19,21,22,25 7:1,4,8,10 10:1,3,7 10:12,18,19,23,24	11:4,5,13,15 12:8 13:1,10,19,21,22 14:3,8,9,11,13,23 14:25,25 15:15,16 15:21 16:2,6,11,22 16:24 17:9 19:8 24:19 28:24 30:15 31:5,16 36:11 38:3 38:3,6,18 40:19 41:23,24 42:9 43:15,24 44:21 45:12 46:2,12,25 47:3 48:10,11,18 48:19,21 49:15,16 50:13 51:7,14,17 56:3 62:16,21 65:17 75:5,10,17 75:17,20,22 76:6 76:22 78:7,8 79:9 82:23 86:20,24 87:5,11,18,19 88:1 88:22,24 89:3,9,11 89:13,25 90:2,10 90:20 91:2,15 95:8 95:17 96:18 recounted 74:17 recounting 103:12 refer 32:19 63:16 reference 42:19 75:7 referring 59:19 64:5 refers 16:11 reflect 58:22 reflecting 55:9 reflects 81:12 regard 37:5,9,16 41:6,10 46:19 48:6 54:23 62:17 93:16 94:3 regardless 16:25 76:11 Register 20:14 23:19 42:16,18 regulation 40:12 76:15 82:6 regulations 15:16 15:18,23 16:20 17:3,12,16 75:5,8	75:9,14,24 76:23 77:2,19,20,25 78:2 82:3,12 84:19 regulatory 39:24,25 40:1,3 93:22 related 15:13 84:20 relates 93:4 relating 89:9 relative 13:10 relayed 63:2 release 43:9 88:16 89:15 released 91:23 releasing 38:18 51:6 relevance 50:23 relevant 18:6 49:9 69:10 74:1 relied 52:18 relief 34:24 rely 24:17 98:14 relying 24:18 remember 19:12 22:12 reminding 67:15 reminds 41:7 reorganizes 94:2 repeated 34:23 repeatedly 40:18 54:7,13,15 replevin 35:25 39:12 99:8 reply 19:3 36:19 86:8 report 12:23 41:18 47:19 72:19 reported 1:25 30:11 64:8 74:4 Reporter 1:25 reports 74:5 represent 16:10 representation 31:8 31:9 56:13 65:2 71:1 97:24 98:15 100:3 representations 65:11,13 66:1 68:23 70:16 representative 30:8	47:14 64:5 represented 80:17 repromulgated 17:15 request 32:23 55:4,6 63:23 64:12 65:16 66:7,20 104:3 requested 58:4,12 required 39:21 72:23 77:16 97:1 requirement 52:12 52:12 requires 38:6 98:4 research 41:21 80:6 103:17 researched 80:12 reserved 94:25 residing 60:25 62:12 resisting 73:25 resolve 29:22 86:23 respect 67:1 respects 16:11 respond 29:24 53:9 69:20 102:14 responded 33:18 responding 11:19 response 5:19 53:2,4 54:7 55:4,6 56:15 60:15 64:11 65:16 restrictions 40:4,5 rests 11:8 39:19 result 20:3 53:22 70:23 97:8,14 98:18 retained 4:23 47:21 retaining 50:10 retains 84:22 retention 39:6 return 8:1,3 9:17,24 11:16 29:16 32:24 34:20 37:21 38:20 39:3,13 49:21 51:5 66:7,10 67:18 87:9 98:23 99:9 returned 30:13 31:16 46:4 47:16 63:4 64:14 70:6 100:15
---	--	---	--	--

Q

question 8:21 11:19
 22:9 27:24 31:12
 34:4 36:9 43:2,20
 43:23 46:20 47:9,9
 50:4 51:11 70:25
 76:18,20 79:17
 82:22 84:8 96:22
 100:2 102:9
questions 40:22
 41:16 53:8 95:12
 100:22 102:15
 103:19
quite 11:22 37:21
 84:24
quote 38:21
quoting 38:16 53:17

R

R 3:1

reveal 65:7	53:20 56:22 66:14	seat 38:9	shift 36:18	79:23 87:13 98:4
revealed 63:3	84:25 85:11,20,22	seated 3:7	short 14:7 86:7	sound 99:3 105:5
revealing 35:17	97:6	second 33:11 43:11	shouldn't 65:24	sounds 11:3 67:11
revelation 65:21	rules 85:11	59:13 65:10,18	98:16	80:7 96:4 104:7,17
review 15:15 16:20	rung 12:11	second-to-last 43:11	show 8:5 53:21,23	span 81:17
19:8,10,17 20:5	running 76:10 77:11	59:6	57:12 97:7,12,14	speak 31:9 48:2
24:7 85:4	runs 61:5	secondary 86:22	98:18	52:10 60:7 62:1
reviewed 7:15 9:7	rush 103:15	section 5:6 29:10	showed 65:10	63:13
75:8		34:25 38:16,21	showing 27:10	special 42:2
reviewing 102:18	S	see 6:9 20:21 27:13	73:10	specific 25:23 88:23
revisit 18:23	S 1:21 2:15 3:1,5	30:25 35:6 39:5	shown 71:2	89:16 95:13 97:3
Richardson 2:5 3:17	S/Elizabeth 105:10	43:25 45:15,17	shown-have-known	specifically 6:22
4:5	safekeeping 88:1	49:7 50:16 59:21	101:22	28:23 29:1 33:5
right 4:3,12 8:16,18	San 73:5	59:21 64:25 70:13	shows 6:20,25 26:11	specificity 42:11
8:18 9:1,13,23	saying 13:5,22 23:1	77:20 90:21	26:14 44:14 58:18	specifics 58:15 60:9
10:20 11:17 12:16	26:1 30:22 37:21	seeing 70:4	64:10,12,16,19,19	60:18 63:12
12:16,17 13:12,24	46:8,15,17 49:12	seeking 39:12	side 18:24 25:20	specify 39:2
13:24 15:13 16:14	58:5 60:2,4,20	seen 42:18	87:15 95:13 101:2	spell 19:5 57:10
17:13 18:13,14,18	61:2,22,24 64:14	segue 24:24	signed 42:3	sponte 79:1
18:21 20:25 22:8	66:25 67:7 69:1	seize 14:8 43:3 48:8	significantly 58:23	square 54:21
22:18 23:14,14	79:19 82:3,6 86:19	51:24 84:6	silent 74:20	stacks 73:14
25:2,16,17 26:5	92:6,7 94:20 95:25	seized 41:25	similar 27:6 69:19	stage 5:10 8:16
28:15 31:14,14	96:5	seizure 42:2,11,12	simply 10:11 13:5	29:23 102:1
32:7,7,21 34:11	says 6:5 10:7 20:22	seizures 43:1	16:22 36:7 48:6	standalone 30:17
36:12 43:19 45:8	25:24 30:13 31:11	Select 12:19,20,22	simultaneous	standard 7:18,20
46:12,25 49:25	31:11 32:3,22 34:1	47:14	103:23,25	8:9 27:5 35:8
50:1,23 51:8 55:15	34:8,19 38:16	seminal 27:4	situation 21:21	101:17
64:21 65:3,24 67:6	43:13 47:15 50:13	send 18:8	23:16,17 69:8	standing 23:12
71:4 72:22,25	53:2 60:16,19 61:3	sense 11:2 36:7	78:22 84:3 85:22	24:10
75:21 76:8 78:9	61:9,19 66:6,10	50:11,12 52:3	88:2 92:1,3 93:19	start 4:18 32:14
80:5,20 84:24 85:6	67:19,19,22 68:13	71:10 83:6 99:18	94:8	47:9 53:16 63:18
86:16 87:13,21	71:13 77:9 78:13	sent 7:25 30:9 33:9	situations 83:21	86:19 95:11,20
88:15 91:8,11,15	81:4,4 83:13 87:17	64:6,13 66:21 74:4	six 7:11 8:7	started 48:2 76:10
91:23 92:3,4,16,17	87:22,23 89:8	sentence 32:22	six-year 5:6 7:9	starting 3:15 22:11
92:20,22,22 93:25	90:13,23 97:4,5	33:11 59:6,13	sleuthing 72:23	22:20 96:15,18
96:3,21,22 98:7	98:15 99:1	separate 22:21	small 100:24	starts 77:11 84:14
100:8 101:4,23	scenario 12:5 52:16	83:25 95:8	somebody 68:12	state 40:11 58:21,22
104:18	78:20,21 79:2	separately 84:9	somewhat 16:15	72:25 73:6 96:1
rights 6:3,14 90:18	80:13,17 81:5	sequence 44:12	son 46:6	stated 34:25 64:6
90:21 91:7,11,17	94:10 102:19	67:17	soon 7:7	72:19
93:1,2,9,20	scenarios 78:18	serve 32:23 66:7	sophisticated 50:20	statement 66:24
rigor 69:24	80:23	service 17:19 27:7,8	sorry 9:19 11:11	79:21
rise 95:14,19	Schwartz 1:21 3:6	session 3:5	19:25 22:1 27:20	states 1:1,7 3:4,13
road 81:22	scientific 50:20	set 80:14 83:22,23	32:25 35:18 36:14	4:8,13,25 6:2,14
robust 66:16	scope 80:9	83:24,25	40:10 43:22 50:3	20:19 30:16 33:12
rock 56:17,18	se 44:4	sets 6:15,17	59:2 69:14 80:21	35:3 43:10 67:9
Rome 81:23,23	search 28:13 29:21	seven 5:1	sort 19:13 62:25	93:22
rule 17:23 28:20,21	71:16	shelf 73:20	63:17 66:21 73:7	stating 30:9

Station 2:17	substantive 8:12	20:13,22,23 21:12	36:24 38:14 67:14	90:19,20 91:22
status 48:3	successor- 9:17	22:16 37:2 38:9	86:3,15,17	94:12,13 97:9
statute 5:6,21 6:11	successor-in- 98:10	45:19 48:5 62:19	Thanks 104:20	99:20
6:12,12 7:9 8:13	sudden 88:13	65:23 78:23 85:14	that's 5:11 8:1,4,15	they'd 88:19
17:6 24:21 25:1,9	sue 54:18 56:19	87:7 88:6,18,19	8:17,21 9:10,12,23	they're 5:20 13:17
37:6 38:16,21,25	sued 56:5	90:5 91:8,8 92:16	10:4,11 12:16,16	13:18 24:18 29:12
39:20 40:12,24	suggest 4:15 16:19	taken 32:24 37:12	13:12,13,15,18,19	30:22 60:3,20
45:3 46:16,23	34:5 68:3 93:3	41:11 44:5,7 46:18	16:14,22 18:17,21	61:11 65:13 69:21
51:12 52:20,25	suggested 66:18	51:11 70:16 91:10	20:20 22:8,21	81:2 95:25 96:5
53:1,3,8 75:1	suggestion 103:11	93:19	23:12,19 24:4,4,13	thing 5:12,13 11:18
76:10 77:9,9 79:11	103:14	takes 11:25 93:8	24:14,15 25:17	12:2 13:13 14:2
92:9	sunsetted 17:14,14	takings 4:20 5:4,8	29:2 30:25 31:4,14	17:18 19:1 23:20
statutes 52:9,11	supplemental 18:2,9	7:6 12:9 13:19	31:14 32:7,7,8,14	24:5 27:19 28:19
statutory 16:23 37:6	94:18 95:1 103:17	24:14 29:9 36:1,3	32:21 33:6,7 38:20	28:21 29:2 30:19
39:17 43:21 48:7	103:19 104:22	36:5 39:24,25 40:3	38:24 39:3 40:12	35:1,1 39:6 56:14
90:1	suppose 79:24 80:3	40:11,24 77:3	42:7 43:2,19 46:11	56:23 74:2 78:12
step 78:10	91:5,7 94:16	79:14 85:21 92:24	48:24 54:11 55:10	82:3 84:6 92:5,12
Stephen 1:21 3:5	supposedly 30:15	93:22 94:14 95:14	55:16,23 59:9,11	92:15,15 97:5 99:2
stick 40:10 92:25	31:5	99:9,10,12,16	60:6 64:4,4 65:20	things 8:4 22:14
93:11,19 94:20	Supreme 92:16	talk 6:3 8:11,12,13	67:23,24,25 70:22	44:17 46:17 49:1
sticks 50:22 91:10	sure 4:19 18:25 19:7	13:22 18:11 21:4	71:3 73:14,19 74:8	51:3 64:16 71:2,3
sticky 97:16 98:20	20:16 21:7 22:15	24:21 40:13 52:20	74:20 75:21 76:8	71:10 73:17 81:6
stolen 59:16,18	31:2,18 33:23	57:14 66:3 93:19	77:4,5,8,16 78:9	83:7,20 103:7
stop 39:15 42:23	48:13 57:11,13	94:18 96:8 100:14	78:14 81:15 82:11	think 9:3,10,23 10:5
storage 88:1	66:20 72:13 81:18	104:18	82:13 83:25 84:13	11:11,21 13:12,16
stored 81:1	81:22 84:15 86:8	talked 18:14 100:15	84:14,15,24 85:4	17:5,19 18:21
Street 2:6	98:3	talking 13:20,20	86:22 87:10,14,17	21:23 24:8 25:5,20
strictly 53:20 97:6	suspend 27:12 97:1	55:12,14 57:16	87:20,22 88:8 89:2	29:25 31:6 35:23
strikes 72:3	98:16	63:25 69:6,7 84:14	90:9 91:18 92:4,5	36:20 40:17,17
stuff 64:10	suspended 7:13	talks 6:13,14 30:3	92:12,15,20,23,23	41:15 46:7 48:13
style 77:11	26:14 96:9,12,21	tangible 52:15 65:25	94:10,25 95:24	50:7,21 51:2,21
sua 79:1	96:23 101:7,7	tape 10:17 13:5,7	96:2,6,7,7,18,21	52:8,11,14,24
Subcommittee 45:7	suspending 97:10	35:14 36:10 76:9	97:15 98:20,20	53:13,17,25 56:19
46:5 48:14 56:8	suspension 7:17	85:13	99:19 100:8 101:4	58:13 59:19 64:10
60:21 62:8 72:19	27:4,6 97:6 98:8	telephone 32:22	101:8,15	64:22 66:16 67:23
subject 58:4 66:14	101:16,19	66:17	theoretical 31:21	69:4,21,22,24
72:20	suss 11:10	tell 21:1 23:17 55:14	theoretically 24:3	71:22 72:1 73:6,16
submit 18:2 65:6	sweep 51:10	100:11	theory 71:12 96:7	76:13 77:2 82:4,22
69:22,23 70:13,19	switch 95:3	tells 5:12	there's 5:22 11:23	83:19 84:13 86:4
79:13 82:16 92:11	synonymous 91:25	temporary 51:2	17:7 22:3 31:12	86:21 87:4 89:24
subpoena 12:15,20	92:3	tension 43:25	36:4 39:4,16 49:3	91:24 92:5 93:8
18:17,19 48:14		term 16:8 83:5	50:21,23 51:8,11	94:1,5,9,12 95:15
49:2	T	terms 6:3 13:21	52:11 54:5,25	95:20,24,25 96:21
subsequent 48:2	T 1:13	40:13 60:19	55:11 56:14 59:10	100:11,22 101:2,4
90:8	table 41:9	102:15	71:9 77:10 78:14	101:22 102:10
substance 24:23	take 4:16 14:13,14	test 71:13 73:10	78:20 79:2,8,13,17	103:20 104:2
41:1 52:5,14,22	14:15 15:9 16:18	text 17:9	80:9 81:3 82:21	thinking 72:14
60:18 92:6	17:24 18:16 20:6	thank 4:19 36:21,22	88:14,23 89:16	80:12 93:20

103:17 third 33:10 79:2 80:12,17 81:5 THOMAS 2:3 thought 4:12 17:1 47:19 65:8 three 63:13 73:2 78:17 80:23 Thursday 1:16 time 7:5 10:18,18 11:13 13:18 15:25 20:5 36:10 38:2 39:3 46:2,14 49:14 49:17 59:11 61:18 62:7,16 63:3 66:25 67:16 77:11 79:3 82:16 84:21,25 85:8 87:25 94:23 95:21 104:6 timeline 45:1 timeliness 12:12,12 28:19 86:22 95:4,8 96:19 timely 30:18 timing 48:6 title 6:3,14 11:14,16 33:12 40:14 50:11 50:12,16 51:14,16 67:9 84:8 87:24 90:18,21 91:4,16 91:22 92:7 today 3:18 4:12 14:23 24:10 37:17 39:9 41:2 43:2 54:9 57:3 104:13 today's 25:7 32:22 told 26:12 67:12 81:2,2,19 toll 70:18 tolling 79:20 tolls 69:11 79:19 Tom 3:17 tomorrow 88:13 tort 80:1,5,7,10 tracked 61:4,23 trail 61:4 62:25 73:7 transcriber 105:1,4 transcript 103:15	104:14,15 105:5 transfer 6:6,7 9:22 40:13 48:2 51:14 51:16 61:17 75:24 82:23 84:22 85:21 90:7 transferred 41:22 42:7,14 43:15 44:23 46:25 47:3 49:17 83:22 84:8 84:12 87:18 90:18 transferring 6:3 transfers 78:15 transmitted 89:10 transparent 57:7 60:10,12,20 66:16 treated 94:5 treating 26:21 treatment 45:25 trees 92:21 tricky 8:21 tried 35:25 trigger 101:22 triggering 44:18 true 9:22 12:3 26:21 28:13,14 truly 9:17 truth 26:24 try 86:17 104:12 trying 7:12 11:10 13:16,17 40:7 69:9 74:11 77:19 80:24 82:5 101:14 Tunheim 47:19 turn 18:6 63:12 71:11 two 5:22 29:24 44:17 64:16 65:6 65:14,15,16 72:5 74:25 86:24 100:24 104:14 typically 84:21	unable 37:21 49:20 unambiguous 32:23 38:20,25 66:7 unambiguously 37:13 unaware 25:22 26:3 26:10 53:23 70:23 97:9,15 98:19 unbounded-in-time 51:10 uncaveated 71:1 understand 8:23 17:13 19:5 23:23 25:11 31:19,20,24 39:18 48:13 67:6 71:6 74:11 96:16 understanding 14:23 69:24 70:7 understands 89:3 understood 8:6 59:11 71:7,14 77:18 101:8 undertake 78:25 undisputed 20:9 unfolded 41:16 Unfortunately 24:9 United 1:1,7 3:4,13 4:8,13,25 6:2,13 20:19 30:16 33:11 35:3 67:9 93:21 unjustified 31:21 unknowable 25:14 53:24 73:11 untimely 7:5 8:10 UPI 30:10 33:7 64:7 67:7,8,16,18,19 72:5 74:5 81:4 UPI's 33:16 67:10 USC 5:6 use 5:25 6:23,24 14:13 33:12 35:15 40:3,4 51:23 83:5 90:25 Usually 4:14	75:22 validly 78:14 valuable 92:5,12,15 92:15 valuation 21:5 22:20 77:3,7,14,15 77:25 78:3,25 value 19:20 70:16 various 72:4 91:1 veracity 27:10,15 versus 3:13 94:15 videos 81:1 view 35:19,20 46:18 85:7 views 87:4 violated 56:22 virtually 5:3 57:2,4 virtue 45:13 63:1 83:17 visitor 55:15 vote 23:18 42:15 vs 1:6	26:9,15 27:2 29:14 30:17 38:4 48:12 52:1 66:19 79:13 84:20 87:4 89:2 91:5 96:11,16 97:10 98:9 99:25 ways 29:25 we'll 8:12 94:18 we're 3:11 13:20,20 13:21 17:9 23:21 38:12 50:19 55:12 57:16 69:9 83:13 88:8,9 we've 34:1 45:10 49:10 50:18 54:8 61:3 81:10 83:12 Welcker 53:18 69:5 73:10 79:22 went 42:9 44:22 46:2 49:15,16 61:15 70:5 weren't 60:4 Westlaw 103:2 what's 3:25 10:8,9 28:6 33:21 40:14 52:5 53:4 56:25 60:8 69:8 99:7 whatsoever 50:16 whereabouts 57:23 59:7 79:7 99:2 who's 82:5 William 32:17 willing 56:19 104:14 Willoughby 1:25 withholding 48:18 WL 103:2 won't 104:12 wondered 89:23 word 62:20 65:23 words 40:25 52:5,8 90:14,17,17 work 15:18 60:12 62:24 74:8,21 working 57:24 58:14 world 40:4,10 93:24 94:2 96:1 worry 18:18 49:1
--	---	--	--	--

<p>worse 46:23 worth 23:4 wouldn't 17:2,11 47:2 76:8 92:10 93:1 102:2 write 54:20 writes 66:5,5 68:12 writing 54:23 written 60:8 wrong 5:4 47:22 65:1,18 97:20,23 99:13,14 wrote 98:11</p> <hr/> <p>X</p> <hr/> <p>Y</p> <p>yeah 8:24 12:14,14 15:22 16:7 21:25 32:19 33:19 34:1,8 42:13 54:12 57:13 58:9 59:7,9 61:19 63:22 68:9,13,17 68:20 70:17,21 71:8 75:12,12 80:11 85:4,6 87:1 89:24 94:13 97:25 98:2,12,24 99:23 years 4:23,24 5:1 7:11 8:7 79:8 81:17 Yep 30:6 32:15 75:2 you'd 4:17 17:15 24:23 36:17 52:22 82:2 86:6 100:21 102:5 you're 11:11 13:5 14:17 22:8 24:25 26:1,21 31:20 40:23 46:8 48:13 49:12 55:14,20 60:2 61:2,5 63:25 64:22,25 65:1 68:13 70:25 71:2,4 75:3 78:15 91:3 92:6,7 you've 10:5 18:14 21:2 46:22 54:14</p>	<p>65:2 66:10 72:3,4 72:4,5,5 81:20 85:22 91:10</p> <hr/> <p>Z</p> <p>Zapruder 15:19,19 19:2,4,7,10,18,19 19:25 20:1,3,5,10 20:13,19 21:21 22:4,6 23:1,16 24:1,6 40:21 41:14 41:19,22 42:22 45:16,25 46:1,9,19 47:10,15,16,20,21 48:3 51:24 52:16 77:10,21 78:22 82:18 83:8 87:14 87:18,24 88:3 Zapruder's 46:6 Zapruders 21:3 22:10,20 23:21 48:9 84:4</p> <hr/> <p>0</p> <hr/> <p>1</p> <p>1 33:6 38:1 41:24 43:13 67:15,20 1-09 63:14 1-14 30:5 74:3 1-29 63:15 1-3 32:14 10 103:18 100 65:11 11 56:22 66:14 114 64:4 12(b)(1) 25:5 12(b)(6) 25:1 53:7 120 63:21 124 14:7 1290.1 16:16 1295 97:2 12th 30:7 13 79:8 1319 97:3 14 74:3 15 1:16 1577 53:18</p>	<p>15th 2:6 32:16 16 34:24 18 38:1,13 1963 4:22 34:22 1965 6:12 13:25 78:5 90:22 1967 33:11 1970s 7:16 13:17 1978 12:20 30:12 31:12,13,16 47:16 47:20 57:23 87:23 100:15 1979 12:21 13:1 79:8 1987 103:2 1988 41:21 1991 7:25 28:24 29:17 32:16 33:3 33:18 34:6 45:10 54:13,21,24 55:2 65:14,15 66:3,12 67:6,7 68:11,16,19 68:22 69:17 70:1 80:20,21 97:17,21 98:22 1992 5:22 7:9 30:14 31:4,8,13,17 33:8 38:4 40:18 41:11 41:13 43:1,12 44:13 45:12,19 48:9,11 51:10,23 52:19 76:9 78:9 80:19 81:19 83:7,7 96:17 100:14 101:6 1997 14:10 1998 7:11 41:24 43:14 45:8 60:23 1st 41:21</p> <hr/> <p>2</p> <p>2 8:1 28:22 32:13 43:8 66:5 87:16 2:00 1:17 2:02 3:3 20 57:3 68:25 20005 2:7 20044 2:18</p>	<p>2014 55:3,6 56:2 65:15 67:4 2015 34:13 36:3,4,6 37:17 39:8 51:5 56:5 57:4,15 61:1 65:9 66:9 68:5,7 70:9 79:5 98:22 99:12,16 100:10 101:4,5 2017 8:6 202 2:8,19 2021 7:14 30:4,8,11 30:24 31:9 44:25 62:18 67:13 68:11 68:16,20 69:17 70:14 78:19 85:19 99:18 2023 36:7 99:17 2024 1:16 50:21 21 74:9 2204 57:3 22nd 34:22 23-704L 1:5 3:13 2501 5:7 29:10 27 8:4 28:23 34:14 57:16 28 5:6 37:25</p> <hr/> <p>3</p> <p>3/1/2024 105:10 30 4:24 103:16,18 104:4 318 9:20 333 97:2 35 30:5 36 16:16 37 41:17 43:8 87:16 37473 103:2</p> <hr/> <p>4</p> <p>4 1:12 41:20 85:5,6 4(d)(1) 38:16,21 4:24 104:23 45 4:22 59:20 104:3 46 59:12 480 2:16 4th 33:8</p>	<p>5</p> <p>5 58:2,8,9,10,11 59:10 61:8,9 50 57:14 60:22 62:11 552 58:11 5th 14:4 20:22 21:12 22:12 41:8 76:3,6 86:25 87:8,9 90:2 93:12 95:1</p> <hr/> <p>6</p> <p>6 57:20,21,21 58:25 59:4 6-46 57:14 616-1061 2:19</p> <hr/> <p>7</p> <p>717 1:14 718 14:7 752 53:18 783-5070 2:8</p> <hr/> <p>8</p> <p>824 102:24,25 89-318 6:11,20 9:8 51:15</p> <hr/> <p>9</p> <p>9 46:7 47:13 901 2:6 91 100:10 976 102:24,25</p>
---	---	---	---	--